

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR.

No. 445.

NEW SERIES.

No. 55.

THE MONTH

A Catholic Magazine.

JULY, 1901.



PRICE ONE SHILLING.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.

BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND Co.
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO: BENZIGER BROTHERS.

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

HISTORICAL PAPERS.

EDITED BY THE LATE REV. JOHN MORRIS, S.J.

1. **The Spanish Inquisition.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
2. **The False Decretals.** By the Rev. RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. 1d.
3. **Cranmer and Anne Boleyn.** By the Rev. JOSEPH STEVENSON, S.J. 2d.
4. **The Pallium.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 2d.
5. **The Immuring of Nuns.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 1d.
6. **The Huguenots.** By the Rev. WILLIAM LOUGHNAN, S.J. 1d.
7. **How "the Church of England washed her Face."** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
8. **St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572.** By the Rev. WILLIAM LOUGHNAN, S.J. 1d.
9. **The Rood of Boxley, or How a Lie Grows.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 3d.
10. **The First Experiment in Civil and Religious Liberty.** By JAMES CARMONT. 1d.
11. **Was St. Aidan an Anglican?** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
12. **The Gordon Riots.** By LIONEL JOHNSON, B.A. 1d.
13. **The Great Schism of the West.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.
14. **Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.

EDITED BY THE REV. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

15. **The Book of Common Prayer and the Mass.** By the Rev. R. C. LAING. 1d.
 16. **Religious Instruction in England during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.** By DOM FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, O.S.B. 2d.
 17. **England's Title: Our Lady's Dowry: Its History and Meaning.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 1d.
 18. **Dr. Littledale's Theory of the Disappearance of the Papacy.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 2d.
 19. **Dean Farrar on the Observance of Good Friday.** By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 1d.
 20. **Savonarola and the Reformation.** By the Very Rev. J. PROCTER, O.P. 3d.
 21. **Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln.** By Mgr. W. CROKE ROBINSON. 2d.
 22. **The English Coronation Oath.** By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R. 1d.
 23. **Blessed Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland.** By the Rev. G. E. PHILLIPS. 3d.
 24. **The Landing of St. Augustine.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
 25. **The Hungarian Confession.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.
 26. **The Reformation at St. Martin's, Leicester.** By DUDLEY BAXTER, B.A. 1d.
- The above in five volumes, cloth, price 1s. each.*
27. **Luther and Tetzl.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. 1d.

LONDON: CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 69, SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.



*A Study of St. Ignatius.*¹

THE indomitable courage of the man must strike even the most unsympathetic reader of the life of St. Ignatius Loyola. Indomitable courage does not make a Saint, but it is an indispensable requisite of high sanctity. Like Gideon, Ignatius might have been addressed as *thou most valiant of men*.² Like Gideon, too, he is recognised by Catholics as a man raised up for the deliverance of God's people in an hour of extreme need. All such deliverers have been either types and forerunners of the one great Deliverer, our Saviour, before His coming, or they have been men full of the spirit of Christ under the New Law. There is great danger threatening the Church in the coming century, and openings great as the danger. We want guides and leaders of the calibre of Ignatius, nothing less. "Of the calibre of Ignatius," I say, not of his Society: it is not the function of his Society to lead, but to obey.

The years of Ignatius's life are from 1491 to 1556, sixty-five years. Of them we will select seven for special study, namely, from 1528 to 1535. Those years witnessed in this country the rise, the course and conclusion of the divorce suit of Henry VIII. The conclusion of that unsavoury transaction was the English schism, which with one slight interruption has lasted to this day. St. Ignatius spent those seven years at the University of Paris. Thither he came up "alone and on foot," as he tells us, in the autumn of 1528. In March, 1535—the year in which, according to modern reckoning, Blessed John Fisher and Thomas More were beheaded on Tower Hill—he took his degree of Master of Arts in the University of Paris: the diploma is still preserved. The ancient University of Paris perished in the general wreck of the Great Revolution. Not to the Seine,

¹ This paper embodies the substance of a panegyric pronounced at Farm Street on the Saint's feast last July.

² Judges vi. 12.

but to the upper waters of the Thames must we repair to find any visible image of what the University of Paris was under Francis I. For the first two hundred years of their historical existence—that is, from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the fourteenth century—the two Universities of Paris and of Oxford were as twin sisters. There was constant migration of students from the one to the other. The matters taught and the methods of teaching were identical. One standard of learning, the highest of its age, was maintained in both. This sisterly union was impaired by that fatal error of our Plantagenet Kings, the French wars, commenced by the dynastic ambition of Edward III., and carried on to the undoing of both countries for a hundred and twenty years. But by that time the two Universities had grown to their maturity in mutual likeness which was not to be put away. In both, the collegiate system had already begun, and it went on in both. The “unattached student” (the Oxford “Chamberdekyn,” the Paris “Martinet”) was gradually reclaimed, and enclosed within the bounds of College walls and College discipline. When Ignatius went there, the University occupied one third of the city of Paris. Writers speak of its “fifty colleges,”¹ and of its “twelve or fifteen thousand students.”² On the other hand, M. Thurot insists that in its palmiest days the University never numbered more than two hundred masters and fifteen hundred students,³ about half the numbers of the University of Oxford at present. The “twelve or fifteen thousand students” may perhaps march with another phantom battalion, the “thirty thousand students” whom Richard Fitz Ralph ascribes to Oxford in the early fourteenth century.⁴ Or it may represent the total population of the University quarter of Paris, including “scouts,” tradesmen, and their families.⁵ The cosmopolitan character

¹ *Life of St. Ignatius*, by Stewart Rose, p. 135. Mr. Rashdall, vol. i. p. 514, gives a list of sixty-eight Colleges founded before 1500. Not all of them would have been in existence in St. Ignatius's time. He says (p. 479): “The true home of the collegiate system is Paris: from Paris it passed to those Universities upon which it has obtained its longest and firmest hold.”

² *St. Ignatius of Loyola*, by H. Joly, p. 91. English translation.

³ See Mr. Maxwell-Lyte's *History of the University of Oxford*, p. 96.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 94, 95.

⁵ Mr. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 580, on careful calculation comes to these conclusions: “There can be little doubt that the academic population of Paris in the fifteenth century could not have ever exceeded some 3,500, if we include the students of the Religious Houses. . . . It is highly probable that at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries the academic

of the University was shown by its division into four "nations," fantastically named "France," "Picardy," "Normandy," "Germany." Spaniards and Italians belonged to "France," and Englishmen to Germany. The four "nations" fought sometimes with one another, sometimes with the town, as at Oxford, where there were similar divisions, not quite so well marked, yet effectual even to the fracturing of skulls between "northerners" and "southerners," Welshmen and Irishmen, besides the immemorial "town" and "gown." To the modern reader the mediæval Universities seem to have been lawless and licentious places. From a narrative of St. Francis Xavier it appears that the Master of a College himself sometimes led the way in debauchery, and sundry of the men bore visibly on their bodies the evil traces of their vicious lives. Then, as ever, evil-doers made a noise in the world, and found chroniclers of their deeds, while holiness and industry went their way unobtrusively; but the holy and the industrious created and sustained the reputation of the University. For them Wickham built and Waynflete and Wolsey: neither Oxford nor Paris could have subsisted as mere homes for roysterers. The University was a large place, and a man found the company, good or bad, that he sought for, or allowed himself to be dragged into. But certainly a pre-Reformation University was no Garden of Eden: a man there knew good and evil, and made his choice. We shall not be far wrong in concluding that, so far as the University of Oxford at present is like her former self of three hundred and seventy years ago, she is like the University of which Ignatius Loyola was a member, and in which he found the materials for the great work of his life. We can put our finger on one common tradition of Oxford and Paris in his day, the tradition of poverty. For Oxford we have the authority of B. Thomas More, recording his reminiscences of the Canterbury Hall of his time.¹ At Paris

population of Paris may have been considerably in excess of 3,500. It is useless to conjecture the amount of this excess, but it will be quite safe to assume that the students of Paris can never at any time have exceeded 6,000 or 7,000."

If we are to fix a number for the total resident members of the University of Paris in St. Ignatius's time, we may most safely say 3,000.

¹ Father Bridgett, in his *Life of B. Thomas More*, quotes from Roper this speech of the ex-chancellor to his family (p. 242): "I have been brought up at Oxford, at an Inn of Chancery, at Lincoln's Inn, also in the King's court, and so from the lowest degree to the highest. It shall be best for us not to fall to the lowest fare first." He proposes to try Lincoln's Inn diet, then that of New Inn. "If that exceed our ability, then we will the next year after descend to Oxford fare, where many grave, learned, and ancient fathers be continually conversant." These words would have

Ignatius was poor, and a helper of the poor. He spent his Long Vacations in begging alms of his countrymen in Flanders coming once in his quest even to London, where he tells us he "received more alms than in any previous year." In the later years of his course the charity of those who knew him prevented his wants, and rendered these begging tours no longer a necessity.

It marks the thoroughness of the man, and at the same time indicates the superiority of the University in point of scholarship, that when Ignatius came up, he found his Latin attainments below the Paris standard; and before he would proceed to philosophy, he insisted on recommencing his humanities in a class of boys at the College Montaigu,—he was then thirty-seven years of age. Thence he migrated to the College of St. Barbara, which seems to have been his College to the end of his course.

In those seven years Ignatius did much more than work his way painfully to a University degree: he founded the Society of Jesus. He breathed his own aspirations,—what they were we shall see presently,—into the hearts of six young members of the University, unknown to one another as to their common purpose, but known to Ignatius, the inspirer of them all. Finally he brought them together and introduced them to one another as brothers. On the 15th August, 1534, in the chapel of St. Denis at Montmartre, hard by Paris, Ignatius and his first companions dedicated themselves by vow to quit all things, to go to Jerusalem, and there serve God. This vow they—*i.e.* such of them as remained at Paris,—repeated year by year in the same place, as the feast of the Assumption came round. By the third year, 1536, three more had been added to their number; and the tale of "our first ten Fathers," as we still lovingly call them, was complete. It is well that I should give their names: Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, Peter Favre, James Lainez, Alphonsus Salmeron, Simon Rodriguez, Nicholas Bobadilla, Claude Le Jay, John Codure, Paschase Brouet, six Spaniards, one Savoyard, and three Frenchmen, all Masters of Arts in the University of Paris.¹

been spoken in 1532. On this story Mr. Rashdall archly remarks: "Even in these luxurious days, the undergraduates' table in some College Halls would represent a considerable come-down to an ex-Lord Chancellor." On the whole he thinks that both at Oxford and Paris, "the kind of living . . . was that of the middle classes rather than of 'the poor.'" (*Universities of Europe*, vol. ii. pt. ii. pp. 659, 660.)

¹ Hence their habitual way of speaking of one another as Master Ignatius, Master Lainez, and the rest.

Such was the birth of the Society of Jesus, the only religious order which may be called the daughter of a University. The University of Paris however proved rather a stepmother than a mother. The University became jealous of her own progeny. Gallicanism and Jansenism estranged the Paris Doctors from a body that always stood strongly for Rome. When however the Society was suppressed, the University did not long survive: thirty years later it sank, unlike the Society, to rise no more.¹ The Society itself became a sort of cosmopolitan University, having its own course of studies, its own examinations, and its own final grade to be reached (ordinarily) only through a series of examinations. I believe it to be the one Religious Order in which solemn profession is conditioned on such a test. The *Ratio Studiorum*, or system of studies amongst us, though forty years later than St. Ignatius, is always supposed to be an embodiment of the methods which he found in vogue at Paris. He and his nine first companions were no mere fiery zealots. But for their University training, neither Francis Xavier could have done his work in Japan, nor Favre, Lainez and Salmeron, theirs in Germany and at the Council of Trent.²

When the Society first came to England in 1580, the gates of the Oxford Colleges were barred to everything Catholic. So they remained shut for 300 years till 1870, the date of the University Tests Act. Catholics came out from thence, though none went in. Of these the Society gathered its share, both of the early and of the late fruit; Campion, Parsons, Bryant, Darbyshire, and others in the sixteenth century, and in the nineteenth, Coleridge, Christie, Tickell, not to mention living names. To-day, alas, this restriction is removed in one more instance by the death of one alive when these lines were first penned, our dear and honoured Master, Richard Frederick Clarke, S.J., late of Clarke's Hall, Oxford. Thirty years ago, as was then necessary, just before the University Tests Act, he resigned his fellowship of St. John's College to become a Catholic. At last a little hand has been put out shyly, and taken with kindness, between the Society of Jesus, now

¹ "The University of France (which succeeded to that of Paris) is at present little more than an abstract term, signifying the whole of the professional body under State control." (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, xxiii. 851.)

² See Father Coleridge in *THE MONTH* for September, 1870, *The University Life of St. Francis Xavier*, an article which he afterwards embodied in his celebrated *Life and Letters* of that Saint.

venerable with age, and the still older University of Oxford, so ancient and so very modern. We may see some small image of the old Oxford coming back to visit herself. From any point of view the meeting is interesting: may God guide the issue.

St. Ignatius used to say that he knew but one hypocrite in the Society, Bobadilla. He meant that Bobadilla was a far worthier man than the first contact with him would have led you to suppose. In no other sense have I known any hypocrite, any dissembler, any one whom Shakespeare would have termed a "politician," among the members of the Society who have watched over me, been my friends, and given me their confidence, ever since I have possessed any powers of observation. I have known them as "all honourable men," above board in their dealings, taking straight means to the end in view without concealment. "Jesuitical" is the last word that I could truthfully apply to the habits and conversation of the living Jesuits whom I have known. But it is no use telling the world this. There must be some secret about such an Order: the very success of the Society argues some craft and mystery. Well, if secret there is, it remains a secret, not for want of telling, but for want of capacity and willingness to understand it. The secret is contained in the Book of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius; and, long before the appearance of that book, it was published in the four Gospels. On the Spiritual Exercises every Father and Brother of the Society of Jesus has been formed, or rather, in this life, is continually being formed, from the first ten Fathers to the living members that now are. It is not for a moment pretended that every action of every Jesuit is guided by the principles of that book: were it so, we should be a race of Saints. But every member of the Society owns to those principles, and more or less makes them the rule of his life. Furthermore, to the carrying out of those principles is to be attributed all the spiritual success which the Society has achieved: I may add, under the blessing of God, all its temporal success also. No Jesuit has swerved from those principles and prospered in his vocation. No church or college of the Society has flourished in the neglect of them. They animated the martyrs of the Society, who were hung and drawn at Tyburn or tortured in Japan.

The principles in question may be reduced to two, and to a third which is a corollary. They are:

1. Man is created to praise God and save his soul ; and he has no business on earth which must not be subordinate to this end.

2. Jesus Christ calls upon all men to follow Him in the conquest of a spiritual Kingdom : every man who has judgment and sound reason will listen to this call, and give himself entirely to this service.

3. (Corollary). For me personally in this world, so far as my higher will and purpose extends, it matters not at all how I am esteemed and how I am treated. So that God be glorified, and my Master's Kingdom grow, let me be ignored and contemned. This does not mean that I have no feelings. It does not mean that I have no wants. I throb and pant with sensitiveness, and cravings animal and spiritual : but this axiom I hold to on the word of Christ,—that while I seek supremely the Kingdom of God and His justice, all other things shall be added unto me, in so far as they make for the above-mentioned end, the one end that I absolutely desire. Therefore, on my part, no self-solicitude, no self-will, no self-interest.

These are the principles : but they take many words to develop, which would not be in place here ; and much thought and prayerfulness really and intimately to apprehend. For instance, the "praise" of God, which means the recognition of God by faith, and the being in God's image by holiness, is long matter of study. It is of course expressed in the Ignatian motto, *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. The principle of personal devotedness to Jesus Christ is the very hub and centre of all things that go to the making of a *Socius Jesu*. The name *Societas* is identical with *comitatus*, the *comes* (count) being the sworn companion of the war-leader, and ennobled by that very companionship.¹ The Anglo-Saxon *thane* (*attendant*, and thence *noble*) has the same meaning. Hence we read of the followers of Brithnoth, the Saxon chief who fell fighting against the Danes at Maldon in Essex,—

They lay thane-like their lord around.

¹ For the *comitatus* see Dr. Stubbs's *Constitutional History of England*, i. pp. 24, 25 : also Cæsar, *De Bello Gallico*, iii. 22. The history of the settlement of Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire is lost on any one who has not grasped this grand Teutonic idea. There was much Visigothic blood in Spain, and apparently a full current of it in the veins of Ignatius Loyola. It is the idea of what we now know as "leadership" and "the service."

St. Ignatius would have hugged that word *thane-like*. It expresses exactly what he wishes the members of his Society to be in regard of their "eternal King and universal Lord," Jesus Christ. Shakspeare's Adam in *As you like it* (act ii, sc. 3) furnishes another expression of the same :

Master, go on and I will follow thee
To the last gasp with truth and loyalty.

The Society of Jesus has no monopoly of this idea. It lies at the very root of Christianity. Cf. Heb. xii. 1—3, a favourite text with St. Ignatius. "Christianity," says the author of *Ecce Homo*, "is an enthusiasm, or it is nothing."

St. Ignatius's thought cannot have been uninfluenced by the crusades of his countrymen against the Moors, terminated happily in the year of his birth by the conquest of Granada. Nor can we read the "Contemplation of the Kingdom of Christ" in the Spiritual Exercises, and thence turn to Pastor's *History of the Popes*, vols. ii. and iii., and read there the efforts of Ignatius's own countryman Calixtus III. and of Pius II. for the recovery of Constantinople, without feeling that we have struck upon another spring and origin of the Exercises, and thereby of the Society of Jesus.¹

Many a capable man has carried selfish motives into the service of a noble cause, and has thereby marred and even ruined that cause. The enterprises of the Stuarts for the recovery of their crown (if we take that to be a noble cause) furnish abundant illustration. Or again, apart from the merits of the cause, we may consider the mutual jealousies of the French Marshals in the Peninsular War, jealousies which led

¹ Constantinople was taken by the Turks in 1453. Pius II.'s Bull, *Eusechielis Prophete*, issued in 1464, contains perfectly the first portion of the *Contemplatio Regni Jesu Christi*, couched in the soul-stirring language of which that Pope (Aeneas Sylvius) was a master. Unfortunately, the leader was wanting. The Emperor Frederick III., "the king to whom all Christian princes and men pay reverence and obedience," fell far short of the Ignatian ideal. The Bull may be read in Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 587. The following extract gives some idea of its tenor : "And who among Christians will be so savage, so stony, so iron-hearted, as to choose to stay at home, when he hears that the Roman Pontiff, the successor of blessed Peter, the Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ, the key-bearer of eternal life, the father and master of all the faithful, with the Sacred Senate of the Cardinals and a multitude of the clergy, is setting out for the war in defence of religion? Now, what excuse can avail any one? A feeble and sickly old man is going on the expedition; and will you, robust and able-bodied young man, stay in hiding at home? The Chief Priest, the Cardinals, the Bishops, are making for the scene of conflict; and will you, Knight,—you, Baron,—you, Count,—you, Marquis,—you, Duke,—you, King,—you, Emperor,—will you loiter in idleness in your own houses?"

them rather to see a senior commander beaten by Wellington than support him heartily in his need and allow him to score the victory and report it as his own to the Emperor. Therefore St. Ignatius bids the *thane*, the companion and knight of Christ to banish from his heart all self-interest, all consideration of pay, promotion and fame for himself in this world, and, as it has been well expressed, "to be content to get good done without minding who does it." Such is the third principle, or corollary to the other two.

Of themselves, however firmly grasped by the intelligence, and however bright the flame of enthusiasm which they kindle in the heart, these principles will not make a hero. There is further need of habituation by their being repeatedly and constantly acted upon. That is a work of much grace, much prayerfulness, and high courage. I am not sure that in its perfection it does not require a certain constitution of body. Intellectual ability certainly, and probably too heroism, is largely conditioned on physical formation, as also on a certain hereditary breadth of view. But, accepted and recurred to in daily meditation, these principles will make a man as much of a hero as it lies in his nature to be heroic. I should not be sanguine in my opposition to any one, whom I saw working out his purpose against me in thorough subservience to such principles.

All the woes and miseries of God's Church upon earth have come from ecclesiastics letting these first principles of their Master's service drop out of sight. These woes were gathering to a climax in the years that St. Ignatius spent at the University of Paris. England was being lost to the Church, and Germany; and the Catholicism of France was very insecure. In the brilliant pontificate of Leo X. few churchmen had appreciated the danger. When the Council of Trent met, fifty years later, the horror and alarm was general; and one of the Cardinal Legates who presided at that Council exclaimed, *Actum est de Ecclesia Romana*. It was not "all over with the Roman Church," thanks in the first place to the promises of Christ, and, under them, thanks to the Council itself, thanks to the many saints whom God raised up at that time, of whom St. Ignatius was one, and thanks in some measure to the Society which Ignatius founded. There was "Reformation," so called, and Counter-Reformation: Ignatius was a Counter-Reformer. A reformer is a man who makes some changes: you cannot

reform and leave things exactly as you found them. A true reformer will not be afraid of change: he will not "sweep away," for evil things are commonly too strong to be dismissed thus suddenly, but he will steadily shoulder out abuses, things base, mean, and ugly, or simply useless and out of date; and where it is called for, he will put in new work. On the other hand, he will have no itch and passion for change: he will avail himself of old foundations, good and sound. Where things once majestic and beautiful have fallen to decay, the true reformation is a restoration, as of an old church or an old picture, and that done, how lovingly, how reverently, with what reluctance to efface or destroy! Even in a living organism, the life of which is said to consist in continual adaptation to environment, every new adaptation must be on the lines of the original constitution, every helpful change must be a renovation of youth. Ignatius disliked change, and sometimes spoke strongly against it.¹ Yet he wrought two great changes in the Church, one in the plan of religious life, and one in the education of clergy and laity. Before Ignatius's time, every religious Order was bound to the recitation of the Divine Office in choir, and every religious man or woman was solemnly professed at the end of one year's novitiate. St. Ignatius's alterations in this respect mark an epoch in the history of religious life. To education, as might have been expected of a Society born in a University, St. Ignatius and his followers addressed themselves with a particular zeal, which has never been relaxed. Of all labours, the labour of education is most welcome to a Jesuit. The Jesuit schools are said to have transformed the face of Catholic Europe. Jesuit missionaries, following in the wake of St. Francis Xavier, have done great things at great cost of blood and suffering in India and Japan, in China, Canada, Paraguay. But the best and most lasting service perhaps which the Society has rendered to the Church has been the preservation of the faith in Central and Southern Germany. That work was initiated by Peter Favre, and after him perpetuated by two other members of the Society, at the sending of Ignatius himself, of whom a prince of Bavaria used to say, adapting the language

¹ There is a saying of his reported in Franciosi's *Spirit of St. Ignatius*, p. 367: "If I were to live a thousand years, I would never cease repeating, No novelties in theology, philosophy, logic, nor even in teaching grammar." This means, I suppose, that there is always a *prima facie* case against novelties. They need particular circumstances to recommend them.

of the Church: "Peter Canisius and Paul Hoffaeus, they have taught us thy law, O Lord." The colleges of the Society in Germany made the work a final success: nor must we leave out of count the German College at Rome, St. Ignatius's own foundation.

The Church is always in danger, not of perishing but of losing ground. The word of her Divine Founder guarantees her existence till His second coming in judgment. But her influence on earth may diminish, and her numbers be thinned, to a point which no theologian can exactly determine. You can never say: This is low water mark: now the tide is bound to turn again in favour of the Church. Always in danger, the Church can hardly be said with any scientific accuracy to be more in danger in our time than in past years. In many respects she enters upon the twentieth century with brighter auguries than she entered upon the nineteenth. No one can know the history of the Church in the days of St. Ignatius's boyhood, and ever wish for those days back again. We cannot pronounce that the peril looming upon us in 1901 is more formidable than that of 1534, when the Society of Jesus was first conceived and came to be a living association within the University of Paris. But there is danger looming over the Church of to-day, very great danger, greater than some of us appreciate. It will be plain to all eyes perhaps in thirty years' time. Civilization and tranquillity have afforded great scope for the Church, especially among the English-speaking races. But the intellectual forces arrayed against her grow stronger and stronger. Never were the main positions of Christianity battered with such heavy artillery of argument as now. So confident have opponents grown, that their prophets are ready with the announcement, that with the twentieth century the roll of human progress enters upon the post-Christian ages. The sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth was an age of theology:¹ ours is an age of history, of science, of criticism. Theological methods were abused then: now the historical method, the scientific method, the method of criticism, all are employed and perverted to disprove the credentials of Christianity. The critic assails the authenticity and veracity of the Bible. The historian insists that, as there have been many, for example, generations of men, many cities and peoples, so there

¹ See the Autobiography of Richard Baxter for the theological vagaries rampant in men's minds in Warwickshire, in the reign of James I.

have been *gods many*, each deity passing away in turn with the votaries who worshipped him, all so many vain efforts to represent the Absolute and Unknowable. The scientific thinker and philosopher of the hour has substituted for our Father in heaven a plexus of natural laws,—the thought of a conscious Mind, if you will; a supreme, all-containing, all-maintaining Mind; but thought that could never have been otherwise, thought that was and that constituted the world from eternity, predetermined and undeviating: thought emanating from a God who is not a Creator, who shows no mercy, who hears no prayer, who works no miracle, who cannot personally interfere with the course of a world consisting of his own irrepressible thinkings, who has in him no loving-kindness, who is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. As the waters of a river stream across the plain, having come down from the clouds and the upper hilly regions, so surely the thoughts of the people to-day are what men of higher education were thinking yesterday; and what the educated few think to-day, the masses will be thinking to-morrow. The educated few at present, the highly educated I mean, are thinking very much such thoughts as I have described.

The Church can never effectually grapple with the world, so long as her ministers fail to grasp the dominant thought of the world. This axiom St. Paul recognised at Corinth, Origen at Alexandria, SS. Basil and Gregory at Athens, and St. Ignatius saw the truth of it at Paris. We are brought round again to the consideration of the work at which St. Ignatius and his companions toiled so wisely and so efficiently, the higher education of Catholics and particularly of the Catholic clergy. You cannot make every priest a paragon of scholarship and science. Yet some awakening of intellectual tastes adds much to any priest's power for good, and is to him a safeguard against occasions and companies that degrade and lower. We remember St. John of the Cross's sudden observation to a penitent who was thinking within herself that her father confessor was a holy little ignoramus: "It is true, child, I am a sinner, but I am not ignorant." There should be, so at least I am apt to think, secular priests in every diocese, and regulars in every active order, educated to the level of the best in the land, masters of literary expression, of history, or of physical science, or of biblical criticism, or of philosophy, particularly of the bearings of all these studies on theology. Of all the questions that will

occupy the Church and her rulers in the twentieth century, none I believe will be found more vital than the higher education of her priesthood in view of the thought of the day. A difficult operation it will prove, delicate, dangerous, and costly. I have no suggestions to offer as to how it is to be done, or where it is to be done, or by whom. This is the extent of my vision, that we need,—not Jesuits, but men of the calibre of St. Ignatius, to get it done somehow, to arrange, direct, and carry out this higher training of the Catholic priesthood, to present to our Bishops for ordination more subjects competent to deal with the historical method, the criticism, the science and philosophy of our age, and better able through all those intellectual envelopes to penetrate to the heart of man, and move it to *thirst after the strong, living God*.

And these will be some of the qualifications of the educational reformers whose coming we look for. They must be in the first place what we in the Society call "men of the Exercises," and that not more in theory than in practice. "Men of the Exercises," did I say? I should say rather, men of the Gospel, whether they are conversant with the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius or not. That is to say, they must be detached from self, indifferent to all but the greater glory of God and the extension of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, cost what it may to them personally, and good work always will cost the doer. They must be discerning men, who can read the signs of the times; large-minded men, who can rise above details, and know a mole-hill from a mountain, yet observant of petty details as bearing on great ends; audacious men, who can and will push; combative men, not to be quelled by opposition that is neither authoritative nor wise,—at the same time men cautious and reverent of antiquity, and loyal observers of ecclesiastical obedience. St. Paul describes them, men whose *hearts the Lord guides in the charity of God and the patience of Christ*.¹ They will require more of their Master's patience perhaps than of any other of His virtues. They must not expect to do everything at once. They must allow for and submit to the rule, that every good work is checked and thwarted, as the work of St. Ignatius was thwarted continually, by the timidity of good men. Their zeal must not be embittered by contradiction. They must be charitable, kindly-minded, gracious, even cordial with opponents. Neither must they sulk, nor fling their burden

¹ 2 Thess. iii. 5.

down, nor desist from the Master's service, because they are not allowed to have everything their own way in the Church. They must never act unconstitutionally, nor speak rebelliously, nor think bitterly. They must sacrifice all things, and endeavour all things, in union with the sacrifices of the Heart of Jesus, and in His Spirit. They must be brave as lions, keen-sighted as eagles, simple as doves, and docile as children, all that, because they love their Saviour dearly and follow near in His footsteps. Where are we to find men of such perfect greatness and goodness,—I do not say such Jesuits, I have not in view the Society of Jesus: but I will say, such Ignatian men? The difficulty of being a Saint, or a great man at all, is being great all round: it is the difficulty of uniting in one self attributes that seem mutually contradictory. It is not difficult to be great in one direction and deficient elsewhere: such men are odd, eccentric, lob-sided, extravagant; and, unless they will submit to control, wayward men too, making mischief of their strength. Such men we do not want. St. Ignatius eminently was not such. The great men that we desiderate to plan and mould the education of our clergy are with God: God will send them forth, *legatos a latere*, from His side, in answer to our prayers. We do need great men, leaders sagacious and bold as ever guided the counsels of the Church. For their coming with the coming century we may fitly pray in the Church's words in the Preface for the Mass of Apostles, *ut gregem tuum, Pastor æterne, non deseras, sed per beatos Apostolos tuos continua protectione custodias*: that Thou, Eternal Shepherd, wilt not desert Thy flock, but through Thy blessed Apostles,—and by the sending of apostolic men of the type of Ignatius Loyola,—wilt continually protect, guard and guide, the Church of the present day.

JOSEPH RICKABY.

The Case for Father Garnet.

II. HIS "GENERAL KNOWLEDGE."

I HAVE endeavoured in my previous paper to show that according to the account furnished by all the first-hand evidence with which we are acquainted, Father Garnet had no information specifically about the Gunpowder Plot except under the seal of confession, which he was unable to reveal until the whole affair became public otherwise, and then only because Catesby, from whom the information came, had consented that in such case the obligation of secrecy should no longer hold.

There remains, however, the farther question to be discussed concerning the "*general knowledge*" which Garnet always admitted, that some Catholics with whom he was on terms of intimacy had a mind to seek a violent remedy of some sort for the cruel oppression under which they groaned, and for what they considered King James' gross breach of faith in their regard. This phrase, "*general knowledge*," is liable to be, and in fact often is, entirely misunderstood. It is clear that when Father Garnet so frequently used it, he did not mean to signify a vague and indefinite knowledge of the *actual Plot*, but an apprehension, pointing to nothing specific, that certain Catholics meant to make a forcible attempt of some kind to better the condition of themselves and their co-religionists. As to this, which is the only knowledge ever proved against him in any manner that can be called satisfactory, it is urged by his enemies, that it was sufficiently specific to have made it his duty to reveal it to the authorities, and fully to justify the penalty inflicted for its concealment; that he would have revealed any such knowledge regarding the schemes of Catholics who were less closely connected with the Jesuit party than were Catesby and others of the conspirators; and that, some months before, he had actually consented to such denunciation in respect of the Bye Plot, which was worked by William Watson and other anti-Jesuit partisans. It is likewise

certain that Father Garnet said hard things, sometimes very hard things, against himself, in regard of this concealment of his "general knowledge" and his suspicions, acknowledging that he had thereby grievously failed in his duty, partly through unwillingness to betray a friend, so that he had rendered himself "highly guilty," and would die "not as a victorious martyr but as a penitent thief," whose ill-example he besought his fellow-Catholics not to imitate, and his accusers point to this as a clear admission of guilt, legal and moral.

On the other hand, his defenders declare that the information possessed by Father Garnet, apart from confession, was manifestly not such as to compel or even to justify a disclosure, which must have resulted in the torture and death of men who were not merely his personal friends, but members of the flock committed to his charge, for whose sake he was himself leading the life of an outlaw with a price set upon his head on account of his priesthood. It was, indeed, the action habitual with the Government in such cases that was the great obstacle to disclosures of such a nature. As the Protestant historian, Oldmixon, reports,¹ when asked by Cecil what hindered him from giving a general warning to the authorities without mentioning names, Garnet replied that Cecil was himself the obstacle, who would assuredly have racked him to pieces to extract all particulars. It is urged, moreover, that he had every reason to believe that if not by his own personal influence, at least by the authority of the Pope, he could effectually prevent any designs that might be entertained from coming to execution; and finally that when he spoke so hardly of his conduct, it was under the influence of mental anguish, produced by an abominable deception, which unfitted him to judge; and that while he never, even amid this distress, varied the substance of his account, he afterwards showed, and notably on the scaffold, that the exaggerated self-reproaches he had uttered did not represent his final verdict on his own conduct.

In endeavouring to indicate what should be our conclusion in regard of the question thus set forth, I will, as in the previous inquiry, confine myself, so far as possible, to the presentation of original and first-hand evidence, stating it fully that the reader may be in a position to judge for himself, and leaving him to do so.

¹ *History of England, House of Stuart*, p. 27.

We may begin with an important point which grows out of the former inquiry, and illustrates the nature of his "general knowledge." If any weight at all is to be attributed to the evidence furnished by Father Garnet, the knowledge of the Plot, conveyed to him in confession by Greenway, was something entirely new and unexpected, utterly different from anything he had previously imagined. In his Declaration of March 9, 160 $\frac{5}{6}$, prepared for the Lords of the Council, from which I have already quoted largely, after describing the communication made to him by Greenway, he thus goes on to relate the effect it produced upon him.

Now I remained in the greatest perplexity that ever I was in my life, and could not sleep anights, so that when I saw him next, I telling him so much, he said he was sorry he had ever told me. Every day after I did offer up all my devotions and Masses, that God of His mercy and infinite providence would dispose all for the best, and find the best means which were pleasing unto Him to prevent so great a mischief; and if it were His holy will and pleasure ordain some sweeter means for the good of Catholics in our country, and this and no other was the end of all my exhortations and prayers.

To the same effect did he express himself in the intercepted letter intended for Greenway, already cited: "I told you after how I could not sleep, and you said you were sorry you had told me."

So on his side Father Greenway testified, as we learn through Eudæmon Joannes, that the effect of his intelligence was to astound Father Garnet (*Obstupuit vir prudentissimus eo nuntio*). Father Garnet himself uses a like phrase, as already quoted from his Declaration: "Thus the matter being opened unto me, I was amazed."

It would thus appear that the information received in confession differed in kind from all that he had previously obtained, and pointed to a danger which hitherto he had not suspected.

When we endeavour to determine more precisely to what the said previous knowledge actually amounted, we shall find two principal items to be considered.

In the first place, there is the famous question propounded to Father Garnet by Catesby, concerning the destruction of "innocents," which requires to be well understood by reason of the misrepresentations with which it has frequently been interwoven.

Catesby, their ringleader, had exacted of the conspirators a solemn engagement not to communicate their design to any priest,¹ assuring them that he could warrant the project on the best authority to be not only lawful but meritorious. Naturally, however, this did not silence all scruples on the part of men who were, as Professor Gardiner believes, "raised above the low aims of the ordinary criminal." Though they had persuaded themselves that with the King, his Ministers, and the Parliament which passed iniquitous laws, they were in a state of war justifying any violence, yet it was evident that not on these alone would the effects of the intended vengeance fall. Many harmless and unoffending persons would be involved in the destruction of their enemies, nay, in all probability some of their fellow-Catholics. Could they with a clear conscience go on with a design that must entail such consequences?

To such difficulties Catesby, still holding the others to silence, promised to obtain an answer that should fully satisfy all scruples. Accordingly, he found an opportunity of propounding to Father Garnet a case of conscience of his own devising, which he assumed to be similar to that really in question, and which is thus recorded by Dr. Lingard.²

To Garnet, the provincial of the Jesuits, he observed, in the presence of a large company, that he was about to engage in the service of the Archduke; of the justice of the war he had no doubt; but he might be compelled to take part in actions in which the innocent would necessarily perish with the guilty; unarmed women and children with armed soldiers and rebels. Could he in conscience obey? Would not the fate of the innocent render his conduct unlawful in the sight of the Almighty? Garnet replied that according to divines of every communion, obedience in such cases was lawful; otherwise it would at all times be in the power of an unjust aggressor to prevent the party aggrieved from pursuing his just right. This was sufficient; the new theologian applied the answer to the intended plot, and boasted to his associates that their objection was now proved to be a weak and unfounded scruple.

To this incident a totally new complexion has been given by the introduction of the religious element as forming part of question and answer. As Lingard further observes (*the italics are mine*):

¹ See the confession of Keyes, P.R.O. *Gunpowder Plot Book*, No. 126, and the examination of Rookwood, *ibid.* No. 136.

² *History*, vii. 48.

According to Sir Edward Coke, whose object it was to connect Garnet with the conspiracy, the question was proposed in these terms: Whether for the good and promotion of the *Catholic* cause against *heretics*, it be lawful among many nocents to destroy some innocents also. But of this assertion he never attempted to adduce any proof; and not only Garnet, but also Greenway, who was present, declare that the case proposed was that mentioned above.

The story is thus told by Father Garnet in his same Declaration of March the 9th:

About the beginning of Trinity Term last (1605), Mr. Catesby asked me, in case it were lawful to kill a person or persons, if it were necessary to regard the innocents which were present, lest they also should perish withal. I answered, that in all just wars it is practised and held lawful to beat down houses and walls and castles, notwithstanding innocents were in danger, so that the battery were necessary for the obtaining of the victory, and that the multitude of innocents, or the harm that might ensue by their death, were not such that it did countervail the gain and commodity of the victory. And in truth, I never imagined anything of the King's majesty nor of anything in particular, and thought it at the first but an idle question, till I saw him, when he had done, make solemn protestation that he would never be known to have asked me any such question as long as he lived. After this I began to muse with myself what this should mean, and fearing lest he should intend the death of some great persons, and by seeking to draw them together, inwrap not only innocents but friends and necessary persons for the commonwealth, I thought I would take fit occasion to admonish him that upon my speech he should not run headlong to so great a mischief; which I did after at the house in Essex, when he came with my Lord Monteagle and Francis Tresham. For walking in the gallery with him alone, my Lord standing afar off, I told him that upon that question lately asked I had mused much with myself, and wished him to look what he did, if he intended anything, that he must first look to the lawfulness of the act itself; and then he must not have so little regard of innocents that he spare not friends and necessary persons for a commonwealth, and told him what charge we had of all quietness, and to procure the like in others, though of this point we had more conference at our next meeting, as I will say hereafter. Oh, saith he, let me alone for that, for do you not see how I seek to enter into new familiarity with this Lord? Which made me imagine that something he intended amongst the nobility.

Substantially the same is the account given by Greenway, of which Lingard's, as cited above, is a summary.

Besides the suspicions and surmises suggested by the case of conscience thus proposed by Catesby, Father Garnet gathered

from various intimations that Catesby and others were disposed to seek some violent remedy for the intolerable evils by which, contrary to all expectation, they found themselves overwhelmed. They had borne up against their trials under Elizabeth, knowing that her reign could not last for ever, and trusting that the new dynasty which must succeed would tolerate Catholics, if it should not actually favour them. When King James came in, whom they undoubtedly believed to have pledged himself to toleration, they hailed him as the fulfilment of their hopes, rejoicing in the "golden day" that had now dawned, and various Catholics took an active part in securing his accession. When, after a brief respite, the persecution broke out more furiously than ever, and it was evident that the hopes so long and fondly entertained were doomed to frustration under the Stuarts, the heir to the throne, Prince Henry, being likely to be even more intolerant than his father, the sense of disappointment was naturally very keen, and, considering themselves to have been duped, various individuals made little secret of their determination not to submit tamely to such treatment.

In support of this resolution, Catesby, who appears to have had a decided taste for casuistry, cited the Papal Breves in Queen Elizabeth's time, of which something has already been said. When these were issued, it was supposed that the Queen's death would be the signal for a general scramble for the Crown among the dozen or so of competitors who were in the field, the Queen's repugnance to any mention of her demise having prevented any definite settlement; and the object of the Breves was to instruct Catholics that, as a large and influential section of the nation, they should support no claimant who would not guarantee them protection, or at least the free exercise of their religion.¹ Catesby argued that Papal sanction was thus given for opposing the King before he came in, if he would not give satisfactory assurances on the

¹ On the subject of the attitude of Catholics at this juncture, Father Parsons wrote shortly after the accession of King James (July 6, 1603), to Father Anthony Rivers, the "Socius," or secretary of Father Garnet, "On the Catholic part many here [*i.e.*, in Italy] do say there hath been omission, in not making some scheme of union amongst themselves and of their numbers and forces, not so much to oppose themselves against the entrance of the present King—for that they have protested—but only that being oppressed in the other Queen's time, and used not like subjects but like slaves, they would now know with what conditions his Majesty would receive them." (*Stonyhurst, Greene, P. ii. 446 a.*)

point of religion, and that the same sanction must manifestly hold good now that James had broken his promises. Accordingly, as we shall hear, Catesby refused to take it on Garnet's authority that the Pope forbade any tumultuary attempts to vindicate the rights of Catholics, thus compelling Garnet to apply to Rome for a formal prohibition, and that he even displayed irritation, reproaching the Father with a wish to deprive his co-religionists of their inalienable right of self-defence.¹

Thus much being premised, we may consider the more important evidence which describes the general information possessed by Father Garnet, and the circumstances under which it was communicated to him. The sketch of the situation given above will, it is hoped, enable the reader to disentangle for himself the various threads of what cannot be made a very orderly tale.

On occasion of his trial, Father Garnet thus summed up his account of the matter:²

Now (saith he) for myself in particular : In truth I protest I am clear from approving this and all other treasonable attempts, and have ever thought and taught them to be unlawful against his Majesty, and have

¹ As I have argued elsewhere (*What was the Gunpowder Plot?* c. vii.), it is difficult to believe that Catesby was as genuine a friend as Father Garnet imagined. It is certain, as Garnet afterwards learnt, that he told grievous falsehoods concerning him to mislead his comrades. At present, however, I prescind from all such questions, the present inquiry being altogether distinct from that as to the true genesis and nature of the conspiracy. I proceed therefore on the supposition that the traditional story is to be accepted as it stands, and I do not anticipate that an opponent of my views on the subject such as Professor Gardiner will differ in any important respects from the substance of these papers. As to Catesby's character, see some good observations in the *Life of a Conspirator*, pp. 139, seq.

² In regard of this trial, the great difficulty is to know what actually occurred. The official account, in the *True and Perfect Relation*, is manifestly altogether untrustworthy. It is largely made up of materials supplied by Garnet's oft-quoted Declaration of March 9, which for some mysterious reason, as testified by an endorsement in Cecil's hand, the King forbade to be used in evidence. A MS. account (Harleian MSS. 360, f. 92) has some curious relationship with the official version, with which it frequently agrees *verbatim*, though at other times it differs absolutely, and in some places has much the appearance of the rough draft of a story in the making. It declares that the Declaration above mentioned was actually read in court. Seemingly the most probable account is that here cited [B. Mus. Add. MSS. 21203, Pluto ciii. f. 27, printed in Foley's *Records*, vol. iv. 164]. As is indicated by incidental remarks which he makes, the writer was in court and took notes during the trial, and his tone is staid and sober. A shorter but exceedingly interesting account is furnished from the Barberini MSS. xxxi. 75, f. 100. This, written in Latin, is the earliest extant account of the trial, being dated from London, April 6, 1606. The trial took place on the 28th of March.

by all my best endeavours laboured to divert and suppress them. Albeit I must confess I did understand in general by Mr. Catesby long since that he would have attempted something for the good of Catholics, which I dissuaded him from so effectually that I had thought he would utterly desist from such treasonable pretences, and this I revealed not, because that as a religious priest I thought to suppress it between him and me, which course our Saviour prescribeth, warning us that if our brother offend in anything we should admonish him between ourselves, and if this prevail,—thou hast gained thy brother, saith our Saviour, and if that reclaim him not, then you may proceed further. Now, my Lords, because I was persuaded that upon this admonition he would give over his former design, I deemed myself in conscience discharged from making any further discovery or overture of that practice; howbeit, that in your common law I think it insufficient, in regard it deemeth it inconvenient to leave the safety of the commonwealth depending on the discretion and peculiar provision of some private man. But yet, my Lords, that I did ever dislike such proceedings, and, as much as I could, endeavoured to reclaim them, your Lordships may gather by the express commandment which I procured by means of our superior, whereby were expressly forbidden all attempts against the King in general; and also by the endeavours I used, as seriously as I could, to procure the like prohibition, and that under pain of some heavier censure, which I would have never endeavoured if I had any way approved it; as also for that I know his Holiness disliked of such proceedings, and as I was informed, commended my care and vigilancy in seeking to repress the former stirs. And lastly, in that I knew them contrary to our obedience which we make most account of, which expressly forbids us to meddle in such causes.¹

From this very clear statement of his own case we see that while Father Garnet acknowledged his concealment of such knowledge as that to which he owned might be a legal offence and punishable as such, he yet held that in his position "as a religious priest" he was nowise bound in conscience to give information to the Government, always supposing he could by other means avert the threatened danger. A somewhat fuller account of the position he took up in this regard is furnished by the Barberini MS., which, though clearly independent, signally corroborates what we have heard above. Confining our attention to this one point, we read in it as follows:

I also endeavoured [said Garnet] to repress such things by censures issuing from the Pope. No one who considers my position and office can find it blameworthy that I failed to reveal the dispositions of those who had recourse to me on any occasion, especially as they seemed to

¹ Foley, *Records*, iv. 183.

me to have given up their project, and conformed to my ideas and desires, so as to undertake nothing for the future which should be at variance with my judgment and opinion. . . . And inasmuch as I was convinced they all had renounced any attempt of the kind, I thought I should proceed no further, since, on the one hand, I believed I had assured the public security, and on the other, I could not think it right that every vague threat blurted out under the influence of anger or irritation by men who came to take my advice should be divulged by me to their undoing.

In what manner and under what circumstances he received information of this "general" character, Father Garnet related on various occasions. A statement made by him (March 13, 1608) upon this subject is doubly instructive, for as it was to be read at the trial as evidence, Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General, indicated in the margin, as may still be seen, what passages were to be omitted, as telling in favour of the accused. The following is the text of the document, the portions here printed in italics being those thus suppressed :

I have remembered some things, which, because they were long before my knowledge of the Powder acts,¹ I had forgotten.

About Michaelmas, after the King came in (1603) Mr. Catesby told me there would be some stirring, seeing the King kept not promise.

And I greatly misliked it, saying it was against the Pope's express commandment ; for I had a letter from the General thereof, dated in July before, wherein was earnestly, by Clement,² commanded the very same, which this Pope³ commanded the last summer. Therefore I earnestly desired him that he and Mr. Thomas Winter would not join with any such tumults, for in respect of their often conversation with us, we should be thought accessory. He assured me he would not. But neither he told, nor I asked any particulars.

Long after this, about Midsummer was twelvemonth (1604), either Mr. Catesby alone, or he and Thomas Winter together, insinuated that they had somewhat in hand, and that they would sure prevail.

I still reprov'd them : but they entered into no particulars.

Soon after came Mr. Greenwell (Greenway) to me, and told me as much.

I greatly misliked any stirring, and said, " Good Lord ! how is it possible that God work any good effect by these men ? These are not God's Knights, but the devil's knights." Mr. Greenwell told this to Thomas Winter, who, about a month after Michaelmas, came to me and expostulated that I had so hard a conceit of him, and would never tell him of it. As for their intermeddling in matters of tumults, since I misliked it, he promised they would give over ; and I never heard more of

¹ Viz., that obtained in confession.

² Clement VIII.

³ Paul V.

it until the question propounded by Mr. Catesby. As for his asking me of the lawfulness of killing the King, I am sure it was never asked me in my life: and I was always resolute that it was not lawful: but he was so resolved in conscience, that it was lawful in itself to take arms for religion, that no man could dissuade it, but by the Pope's prohibition, which afterwards I inculcated, as I have said before.

Two days later, March 14,¹ he gave the following information:

He confesseth that about Michaelmas was twelvemonth (*i.e.*, in 1604), Catesby and Winter, or Mr. Catesby alone, came to him in White Webbs² and told him there was a plot in hand for the Catholic cause against the King and the State, which would work good effect, from the which when this examine dissuaded him, Catesby said he was sure it was lawful, and used this argument that it being lawful by force of the Breves of the Pope to have kept the King out, it was as lawful now to put him out. (Whereupon he urged the Pope's prohibition, and he promised to surcease.)³

On the previous day he had given the following account of the Breves:⁴

First of the two Breves sent to my hands in Queen Elizabeth's time, a year (as I think) before her death, together with a copy of a letter to the Nuncio in Flanders. One of the Breves was to all lay Catholics, the other to the Clergy. The effect of both was that none should consent to any succession, being never so near in blood, except he were not only such as would give toleration to Catholics, but also would with all his might set forward the Catholic religion, and according to the custom of Catholic princes submit himself to the See Apostolical. The effect of the letter to the Nuncio was that he should be very vigilant, and when he heard the Queen to be dead he should in the Pope's name intimate his commandment to all the Catholics in England. I had no commission to divulge any such thing, and so I kept them very close, and when I saw the Queen dead, I burned them. Yet had Mr. Catesby, and, I think, Thomas Winter, seen them, and so they made use of them. For Mr. Catesby said why were we commanded before to keep out one that was not a Catholic, and now may not exclude him? Neither had I any other reason to use against him but that which I mentioned in another declaration, that the Pope himself

¹ P.R.O. *Dom. James I.* xix. 44.

² A house in Enfield Chase rented by Father Garnet.

³ The words within brackets are added by Garnet himself, the rest of the document being in the hand of a clerk who took down his deposition.

⁴ *Dom James I.* xix. 42.

had given other orders, and now all princes were very joyful as well as the Pope.¹

Farther information on this point comes to us from Greenway, both directly in his narrative and through Eudæmon Joannes. It may most conveniently be presented, as it is summarized from these sources by Dr. Lingard.²

At home Catesby had been indefatigable in the prosecution of his design. But though he might rely with confidence on the fidelity of his accomplices, he knew not how to elude the scrutinizing eyes of his more intimate friends. They noticed the excited tone of his conversation, his frequent and mysterious absence from home, and his unaccountable delay to join the army in Flanders. Suspicion was awakened, and Garnet, the provincial or superior of the Jesuits, having received some general hint of a conspiracy, seized an opportunity to inculcate at the table of Catesby the obligation of submitting to the pressure of persecution, and of leaving the redress of wrongs to the justice of heaven. Catesby did not restrain his feelings. It is to you, and such as you, he exclaimed, that we owe our present calamities. This doctrine of non-resistance makes us slaves. No authority of priest or pontiff can deprive man of his right to repel injustice. This sally converted the suspicion of Garnet into certainty. He resolved to inform his superiors in Rome, and received in return two letters of similar import, one written in the name of the Pope, the other from the General of the Order, commanding him to keep aloof from all political intrigue, and to discourage all attempts against the State.

Of Garnet's dealings with Francis Tresham, another member of the more turbulent party, and ultimately one of the actual conspirators, we learn by a declaration of Anne Vaux, who was his cousin.³ After mentioning his frequent visits to White Webbs, she thus continues :

At those times, Mr. Garnet always gave him good counsel, and persuaded him to rest contented. She remembereth he would use these words : " Good gentlemen, be quiet ; God will do all for the best ; we must get it by prayer at God's hands, in whose hands are the hearts of princes." She further remembereth that Mr. Tresham came to a house at Erith . . . where, talking with Mr. Garnet, he gave the said Tresham good counsel, insomuch as when he came from Mr. Garnet,

¹ Father Garnet goes on to speak of the project entertained at one time of securing a Catholic succession by foreign aid. As he says, "The Queen died before any conclusion of practice or execution," and as in his letter to Greenway, already given, he declares that he himself never approved or abetted such a scheme, it is unnecessary to confuse our issue by the introduction of this topic.

² *History*, vii. p. 52.

³ *Gunpowder Plot Book*, 212.

Mr. Tresham said openly, here is all full of good hopes. . . . The last summer he was likewise at another house they had, where he had some conference with Mr. Garnet, where likewise he exhorted him to all patience.

From what we have seen, it is clear that the tone adopted by Catesby was so little submissive as to make it imperative to invoke some higher authority than Garnet's own, if there was to be any security. Application was therefore made to Rome for an express and peremptory prohibition of all violent attempts. There arose, however, a further difficulty, for when orders sent from Rome were quoted to him, Catesby replied that he was not bound to accept the Pope's wishes on such authority, and unless he could be sure that the state of things had been properly represented. At last, as Lingard relates,¹

A sort of compromise was accepted; that a special messenger should be despatched to Rome, with a correct account of the state of English Catholics, and that nothing should be done on the part of the conspirators till an answer had been received from the Pontiff. The messenger was accordingly sent, with a request secretly added by Garnet, that the Pope would prohibit under censures all recourse to arms. Thus each party strove to overreach the other. Catesby's object was to silence Garnet, and to provide an agent at Rome, whom he might employ as soon as the explosion had taken place. Garnet persuaded himself that he had secured the public tranquillity for a certain period, before the expiration of which he might receive the Papal prohibition.

The history of these transactions is told by Father Garnet, in his Declaration of March 9th, from which we have drawn so much information. After the relation already given of his conversation with Catesby, in Essex, when he came there with Monteagle and Tresham, he thus continues :

I was at that time to write to Rome, and as before I had written to inform the Pope of the state of Catholics, and upon occasion of the little tumult in Wales,² desired the Pope would expressly prohibit all commotions, so now I thought it was good to take information of them how things stood with Catholics, the more to confirm the Pope in that course which verily he desired. I asked what they three thought of the force of Catholics, whether they were able to make their part good by arms against the King. My Lord Monteagle answered, if ever they were they are able now, and then added the reason, the King (saith he)

¹ *History*, vii. 55.

² A disturbance arising out of the refusal of a clergyman in Herefordshire to bury a Catholic.

is so odious to all sorts.¹ I said this was but a conditional proposition ; I must have a direct answer, for I would write to the Pope a certainty. They answered negatively. Why then, said I, you see how some do wrong the Jesuits, saying that they hinder the Catholics from helping themselves, and how it importeth us all to be quiet, so as we must and will be. . . . So I concluded that I would write to the Pope that neither by strength nor stratagems we could be relieved, but with patience and intercession of Princes. When I say I wrote to the Pope, I mean to my immediate Superior, who should inform him, for I never wrote myself. . . . Presently, after this meeting, I received a very earnest letter from our General, Father Aquaviva, one for myself, and another for Mr. Blackwell,² which he saith he hath written *ex mandato Papæ*, that we were expressly commanded by his Holiness to hinder by all possible means all conspiracies of Catholics ; that he was not, neither would be unmindful of us, and if (which God forbid) any tumult should be raised, it would not only be prejudicial to the persons of Catholics, and the whole Catholic cause, but it would somewhat diminish the great desire and care he had for to do us good ; and in particular he wrote to me that besides all this, it would greatly impair the credit and good estimation of our Society, for men would hardly be persuaded but that the Jesuits were either consenting, or at least privy to any such action. The effect of this letter was presently published by Mr. Blackwell.

I forget the conclusion of our conference with my Lord Monteagle, for Mr. Tresham said we must expect the end of the Parliament, and see what laws are made against Catholics, and then seek for the aid of foreign princes. No (said I) assure yourselves they will do nothing. What (saith my Lord Monteagle), will not Spain help us ? It is a shame. Then, said I, you see we must all have patience. . . . Soon after, Mr. Catesby came again. . . . We thought that of set purpose he did absent himself from London for some debts ; but it seemeth it was not so. I showed him my letter from Rome, and admonished him of the Pope's pleasure. I doubted he had some device in his head : whatever it was, being against the Pope's will, it would not prosper. He said that what he meant to do, if the Pope knew, he would not hinder, for the general good of our country. But I being earnest with him and inculcating the Pope's prohibition, who amongst other reasons of his prohibition did add this *quia expresse hoc Papa non vult et prohibet*,

¹ Lord Monteagle is best known as having been the instrument of the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, by his disclosure of the anonymous letter of warning which he had received. In an undated letter to King James, which, however, was clearly written at an earlier period, he expressed his desire to become a Protestant, speaking most bitterly of the Catholic faith, of which he continued to appear a vigorous champion to the end of his days. On the 3rd of October following the conversation here recorded, he was a commissioner for the prorogation of Parliament, a distinction very unusual for one in his position, his father, Lord Morley, being still alive, and the title by which he had been ennobled coming through his mother.

² The Archpriest under whose jurisdiction were the secular clergy in England.

he told me he was not bound to take by me knowledge of the Pope's will. I said, indeed my own credit was but little, but our General, whose letter I had read unto him, was a man everywhere respected for his wisdom and virtue. So I desired him that before he attempted anything he would acquaint the Pope. He said he would not for all the world make his particular object known to him, for fear of discovery. I wished him at the last in general to inform him how things stood here by some lay gentleman. This I did of purpose to have the Pope say as much to him that should go, as he had said to us, which would be a more effectual way of preventing all attempts. In fine, he promised he would do nothing before the Pope was informed in general by such a messenger. I myself propounded [*i.e.*, proposed] Sir Edward (Edmund) Baynham, who was already determined to go into Flanders, but that I would not be the author of his going farther than Flanders, for that the Pope would not take well that we should busy ourselves in sending messengers. Sir Edmund came to me. I desired him to go to the Nuncio in Flanders and inform him how things went, but not in my name. As for his journey to Rome, I took no knowledge, nor knew of any intention he had, but according to my desire to inform how things stood, to the purpose aforesaid. . . . These two meetings (I take it) were soon after midsummer. Mr. Catesby both times offered to tell me his plot; the first time he said he had not leave [from his associates], the second, he had gotten leave, but I refused to know, considering the prohibition I had; neither did he or any of the other conspirators ever reveal it unto me.

In respect of the letters written to Rome by Garnet to secure the object of which we have heard, although the originals appear to be no longer extant, we have the evidence of Father Gerard, who had access to them, and who in his *Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot*, reproduces the most important portions.¹

Writing to Rome, August 29, 1604, Father Garnet said :

If the affair of toleration go not well, Catholics will no more be quiet. What shall we do? Jesuits cannot hinder it. Let Pope forbid all Catholics to stir.

On September 21st, after assuring his Superior that charges of political action on the part of the Jesuits are in England known to be false by enemies as well as friends, he goes on to say : "Although they cannot hinder what every tumultuous head intendeth, yet can they carry with them to peaceable courses the best and most Catholics."

On the 8th of May, 1605, he wrote, the passage italicized being in cipher :

¹ Published in *The Condition of Catholics under James I.* See pp. 72, seq.

All are desperate, divers Catholics are offended with Jesuits ; they say that Jesuits do impugn and hinder all forcible enterprises. I dare not inform myself of their affairs, because of the prohibition of Father General for meddling in such affairs. And so I cannot give an exact account ; this I know by mere chance.

On the 24th of July, he wrote in Latin to Aquaviva :

We have received your letters and accept them with all the reverence due to his Holiness and your Paternity. For my part, four times up to the present I have hindered disturbances. Nor is there any doubt that we can prevent all public taking up of arms, as it is certain that many Catholics would never attempt anything of this sort without our consent, except under the pressure of a great necessity. But two things make us very anxious. The first is lest some in some one province should fly to arms, and that then very necessity should compel others to like courses. For there are not a few who will not be kept back by a mere prohibition of his Holiness. There are some who dared to ask, when Pope Clement was alive, whether the Pope could prohibit their defending their lives. They further say that no priest shall know their secrets, and of us by name even some friends complain that we put an obstacle in the way of their plans. Now to soften these in some way, and at least to gain time, that by delay some fitting remedy may be applied, we have advised them that by common consent they should send some one to the Holy Father, which they have done, and I have directed him into Flanders to the Nuncio, that he may commend him to his Holiness, and I have sent by him letters explaining their opinions and the reasons on both sides. These letters are written at some length, as they will be carried very safely. And this for the first danger. The other is somewhat worse, for the danger is lest secretly some treason or violence be shown to the King, and so all Catholics be forced to take arms. Wherefore, in my judgment, two things are necessary : first, that his Holiness should prescribe withal what in any case is to be done ; and then that he should forbid any force of arms to the Catholics, under censures,¹ and by Brief publicly promulgated, an occasion for which can be taken from the disturbance lately raised in Wales, which has at length come to nothing. It remains that as all things are daily becoming worse, we should beseech his Holiness soon to give a necessary remedy for these great dangers, and we ask his blessing and that of your Paternity.

Father Garnet, as we have seen him aver in the letter destined for Greenway, trusted that he had thus sufficiently provided against actual danger to exonerate him from the obligation of consigning to certain destruction Catesby and other friends, which must have been the result of any information lodged

¹ *I.e.*, under pain of excommunication.

with the Government concerning them. As he wrote in the said letter :

I said that I had persuaded, privately, Mr. Catesby from all attempts till he knew the Pope willing, *which I knew would never be.*

He speaks more fully on the same point in his Declaration (of March 9), adding some particulars which may serve to conclude our present examination :

As I ceased not to commend the matter daily to God [after knowing all in confession], so I did not omit to write continually to Rome, for to get a prohibition under censures of all attempts ; for I had much pleased the Pope with informing that I was sure there would be no general tumult in the realm but we could and would hinder, but that I feared some particular desperate courses which could not be prevented but by censures. I had once answer that the Pope did think that the general prohibition would serve, yet did I expect still further proceeding ; and that hope and Mr. Catesby's promise of doing nothing until Sir Edmund had been with the Pope, made me think that either nothing would be done, or not before the end of the Parliament ; before which time we should surely hear, as undoubtedly we should if Baynham had gone to Rome so soon as we imagined. But when we were coming up towards London again [in October] . . . I gathered that all was resolved ; and not daring to go to White Webbs, and being disappointed of two houses which had been taken about London, because they were unfit for our purpose, we were glad to seek to sojourn in the country for awhile till we could get a house about London, and so accepted the offer of Sir Everard Digby to be his tenants at Coughton, being also indifferent to have sojourned with him at his own house ; but it was too little, and I perceived also an intention in him to draw us to that country, for their own projects, which I could well imagine, but was not in particular acquainted withal ; though I perceived by their familiarity and proceedings that Sir Everard was drawn in also. Mr. Catesby and he promised to come to us at Allhallow-tide, but they broke, and I assuredly (if they had come) had entered into the matter with Mr. Catesby, and perhaps might have hindered all. Other means of hindrance I could not devise, as I would have desired ; but it has pleased God of His goodness to hinder it in so strange a manner. If in any way my prayers worked anything, I am glad ; I am sure there wanted no good desire.

In this passage it is evident that Father Garnet is speaking of the use he might have found means to make of his sacramental knowledge had he been able to treat personally with Catesby. As no meeting with him occurred, nothing of this

kind was possible, and Father Garnet was unable to do anything directly to check Catesby's wicked and insane project. But that the steps he had taken long before and earnestly pursued, in consequence of his surmises that some violence was in contemplation, were far from barren of results Father Gerard strongly argues, writing as follows :

How effectual his persuasions were, may appear in that, when the gentlemen [*i.e.*, the conspirators] were up in arms, no Catholic of account would come to assist them, no, not those that were hard by the place, and men of great power, much greater than those that were risen ; yea and some of them near of kindred, some nearly allied to them ; and yet they would neither go, nor send them any assistance, yea they shut their gates against them, when others came to demand it. Such was their resolution to obey the order they had received and to keep themselves quiet, according to the commandment they had from his Holiness, by the means of Father Garnet made known unto them. And whereas, Father Garnet did fear at the first, and afterwards find, that he could not rule some others so well, then he persuaded to defer at the least all such practices, until they had sent to know his Holiness' will : he, in the meantime, labouring as you have seen to have an effectual prohibition on the same authority.

Such is, I think, a fair sketch of the original evidence bearing upon the two points proposed for examination at the outset of this inquiry. Firstly, had Father Garnet any specific knowledge of the actual Plot, or anything like it, outside of the confessional? Secondly, did his general knowledge of Catesby's turbulent projects make it criminal on his part to do no more to thwart them than he actually did? The answer to these questions the reader, I trust, is now in a position to supply for himself, but I will conclude with two extracts recording how Garnet summed up his own case at the bar and on the scaffold. Nothing is more remarkable than the absolute fearlessness of a man so timorous in matters of conscience, when it was question only of his own life, and principles were at stake.

The Barberini MS. thus relates the close of his speech to his judges :

Lastly, inasmuch as it is charged against me that I did not reveal this whole affair of the Powder, which I knew only through confession, you must know that howsoever you may hold me guilty on this score according to your laws, I should have been guilty by the laws of God and his Church had I acted otherwise. And accordingly, let them

look to it who are about to deal with my life, whether they can judge me to have been an accomplice in what neither by word nor deed did I approve; and let them not proceed upon suppositions, but upon what they have learnt either from my own admissions, or certain testimony; and if so, they will find that I have done nothing repugnant to my profession, nor to my duty towards the King, for whose safety though as you say I should have provided, yet by no means was this lawful for me if it involved a breach of the seal of confession, which (knowledge) never would I have mentioned but in a case in which permission had been given.

What occurred on the scaffold is thus related by the "Romish eye-witness" whose account is preserved in the Record Office.¹

Then when he was about to speak of the Catholic faith, the Recorder, interrupting him said: This speech is to no purpose. The King has commanded us to come here to put you in mind of your treason towards him and the State. You must know therefore that you have been brought to this place, that you may acknowledge the crime for which you are about to suffer the due punishment of the law. I therefore exhort you to confess your treason and beg his Majesty's pardon. The Father replied, I beg the King's pardon for what I have done against him. Then the Recorder turned to the people and said, Do you hear? He begs the King's pardon for the Gunpowder Plot. Not at all, replied the Father, you are doing me an injury. By no means am I guilty of that crime. It is imputed to me, because I concealed what I knew only in sacramental confession. I grieve therefore and am very sorry if the King considers that to be a crime, which God considers a virtue. . . . As a dying man I assure you, I knew nothing of the plot of blowing up the Houses of Parliament, except in confession, which I could not reveal. On the contrary, I always hated and abominated plots of this nature, not only because they are wicked in themselves, but because I know they are disapproved by the Holy See. Besides, no true Catholic could approve of such designs, and for my part I always deemed that all Catholics should abstain from such turbulent endeavours, and in their patience possess their souls. Here the Recorder interrupted him and said, But you knew of it out of confession, for Catesby expressly told you of it; we have your handwriting to prove it. Whatever, replied the Father, you have under my handwriting, I will not deny, but indeed you have not this; for Catesby told me only in general terms, that some attempt was about to be made to raise up the Catholic faith, now so oppressed and overthrown; but he told me of no plot, nor of any attempt in particular, and, as I hope to be saved, this is all he told me about it. Will you beg pardon of the King, said the Recorder,

¹ *Dom. James I.* xxi. 5.

for having concealed this crime? So far will I, replied he, in that I did not communicate my suspicion to the Council, and no farther. But I ceased not to exhort and advise all to attempt no conspiracy, and I wish you to understand that I hold the Plot in such abhorrence, that even had it been successful, I should have always hated both the crime and its authors.

Still more explicit is the statement of his position as given by another reporter of the scene.¹

The ministers were earnest that he should ask the King's forgiveness, but he refused that saying he had not offended him; yet the ministers much persisted in that; and Father Garnet still answered he had not offended him, yet he died in that affection as he was desirous to forgive and be forgiven of all men living; neither was there any demerit of his in this late treason of powder towards the King, except men would interpret that to be offensive for not revealing the discontent of any that he was acquainted withal in private; in which he thought he did proceed according to his function: yet so far forth as it was offensive he asked forgiveness of all men, in case there were any offence in that or any other of his actions.

It would be impossible to sum up his case better than Garnet himself has thus done. Can it be said that the evidence we have been considering at all justifies the official legend which for close on three centuries has figured on the front of the history given to the world by those who took his life, "*A True and Perfect Relation of the whole proceedings against the late most barbarous Traitors, Garnet a Jesuite and his Confederates*"?

J. G.

¹ John Powell, interpreter to the Spanish Ambassador. Transmitted to Rome from Brussels, by Father Wm. Baldwin, July 3rd, 1606.

An Emigré Priest in England.

1792—1801.

II.

IN one of his letters, M. Goudemetz describes how he used to spend the day when on a visit to his friends in the country. This picture of English country life a hundred years ago, drawn by a French Curé, has a certain piquancy: "This," he says, "is the order of the day when we stay at home, which happens one day out of two." He states that he begins the day with half an hour's meditation, naïvely confessing that he has occasional distractions, caused by the recollection of the previous day's enjoyments:

At 9, the breakfast bell rings . . . what with tea drinking and reading letters and newspapers breakfast lasts till 10½. We afterwards walk in the orchards and gardens for an hour; then the ladies retire to their rooms and are invisible till dinner-time, while we recite our breviary, mend our clothes, remain in the library, or else pay some morning visits in the neighbourhood. Every day we have to shave and make "a grande toilette," without, however, using powder; this lasts from 2 to 3, when we dine. . . . Nearly every one speaks French, which makes the meals more cheerful. . . . After dinner, we barely have time to walk four times round the garden before the bell rings for tea, after which supper follows almost immediately.

If M. Goudemetz' life in London was straitened, and his fare a meagre one, he must have made up for these privations during his stay under the hospitable roof of Thomas Meade!

We are inclined to wonder how our Curé was able to say Mass when on these lengthened visits to Protestants, at a time when Catholic chapels in England were few and far between. He himself satisfies our curiosity on the subject and informs us that he managed to say Mass, at least on Sundays. When at Blacklands, in Somersetshire, he used to walk over on Saturday evening to Laycock Abbey, the home of the Countess of

Shrewsbury,¹ say Mass on Sunday, and walk home on the Monday. When the Meades removed to Chatley, near Bath, he went either to the Catholic chapel at Bath or else to Frome, where Mrs. Porter, a pious Catholic lady, had a private oratory. These different expeditions delighted the good Curé; he writes to a *confrère* in 1796:

I return to you, my dear Bernage, in order to converse with you on the subject of our good and generous English people. You will acknowledge that one feels a void on leaving them. . . . I allude to the pleasant liberty we enjoyed, to the warm welcome that grew warmer every day, to the friendly neighbourhood, where we felt so perfectly at ease, to the venerable Countess of Shrewsbury, to whom I trust that you paid the debt I owe her.

More fortunate than many of his fellow-priests, M. Goudemetz had brought with him from home a small sum of money, which lasted about eighteen months, and enabled him to live without applying to the Committee that had been formed for the relief of the French exiled priests. This Committee was founded in 1792, and among its members were the Duke of Portland, the Marquis of Buckingham, the Anglican Bishop of London, and the Lord Mayor. Four bankers were chosen to receive the subscriptions, which at the end of November, 1792, had reached the sum of £33,775. The Bishop of St. Pol de Léon, who had been one of the chief promoters of the scheme, was chosen to distribute the money. Each applicant was bound to produce a certificate signed by his Bishop or by some well-known ecclesiastic. If his claims were justified, he received a monthly allowance of two guineas, besides a supply of clothes if he needed them. Over four thousand priests were assisted in this manner.

When the money he had brought with him from home came to an end, M. Goudemetz applied to the Committee. He writes in April, 1794, to M. de Toustain, a refugee priest at Brussels:

The strictest economy has not prevented my purse from getting empty. On the 22nd February, 1794, I presented myself to the committee, not as a conqueror who comes to seek a crown, but as a beggar who holds out his hand for alms. If the demon of pride objected that my act was humiliating, I quickly closed his lips by putting forward the extreme generosity of the English.

¹ Probably Elizabeth, daughter of John Dormer, of Peterley, Buckingham, afterwards Lord Dormer. She married in 1758 George, fourteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, who died without issue in 1787.

With the two guineas a month that were allowed him, M. Goudemetz paid for his rent, washing, and food; but, in spite of this timely assistance, it was sometimes difficult to make both ends meet, and many of the refugees bravely set to work to increase their slender incomes. M. Leleu, Curé of Grigny, who had been president of the little colony of Pentonville, made mattresses French fashion, and sold them for £2 each, and, at the suggestion of M. Goudemetz, Mr. Meade hastened to give him an order. Besides this, he made snowshoes and goloshes, and again Mr. Meade, his wife, children, and servants were among his customers. Another of our hero's best friends, M. d'Epinay, Curé of Beaumetz, made necklaces, fans, and bracelets, to the amusement of M. Goudemetz, who writes to him:

Allow me to ask you how you reconcile the ornaments you are making with the austerity of the Gospel? We hear that St. Paul earned his living by making mats, but he sold neither neck kerchiefs or fans.

M. de Maussac, Vicar General of Rouen, was a house-agent, and Mr. Meade employed him when he came up to London. M. de Bernage, Curé of St. Victor, gave French lessons. M. de Toustain, who came to London from Brussels, was professor of mathematics.

As for our hero, his ready pen stood him in good stead, and here again we must admire Mr. Meade's thoughtful and practical kindness. M. Goudemetz employed his hours of leisure in collecting notes and documents bearing on the trial of Louis XVI. and other events of the Revolution. He submitted his manuscript to Mr. Meade, who expressed his intention of translating it and of having it printed at his own expense, adding that the profits remaining after the sale should go to the real author. "This new proof of kindness," writes the grateful Curé to his English friend, "only adds more and more to the debt I owe you already." Mr. Meade published the book by subscription, and, owing to his exertions and to those of his friends, one thousand copies were disposed of before the volume had left the printer's hands.

The title runs thus:

Judgment and execution of Louis XVI., king of France, with a list of the members of the National Convention, who voted for and against his death; and the names of many of the most considerable sufferers

in the course of the French Revolution, distinguished according to their principles; by H. Goudemetz, a French clergyman, emigrant in England.

The book is dedicated to the "truly humane and benevolent" benefactors of the "afflicted stranger."

M. Goudemetz naively confesses that his work had no literary merit, and in this we must agree with him. It is merely a compilation, a dry list of names, followed by an account of the King's death and by his last testament, but the interest excited by the subject was so keen, and the desire of the public to benefit the author so general, that the venture was after all a successful one. After the expenses had been paid, there remained a balance of £131, which Mr. Meade placed in the English funds in the name of his friend.

I do not know which to admire most [writes our hero to his benefactor], your indefatigable exertions to be of use to me, or this unexpected success! . . . No doubt, I did not need this new proof of your friendship. It is only with thanks and again many thanks that I can repay so great a service.

With a delicacy that does him credit, M. Goudemetz now hesitated to accept the monthly allowance bestowed on him by the Committee. Mr. Meade insisted upon his doing so, urging with much good sense that the sum of money brought in by the book would be invaluable in case of illness, or when he returned to France.

The two friends made a new venture of the same kind, but with less success. M. Goudemetz' second book was called, *Historical Epochs of the French Revolution*. It was again translated by Mr. Meade, and dedicated to the Duke of York, but, though a slight profit was made upon it, it did not meet with the same reception as the first work.

That same year, 1796, our Curé made a change in his mode of life. One of his friends, named M. Heude, formerly Curé of St. Patrice, at Rouen, had been promised by a rich Catholic, Lady Fermor, who lived at Bristol, an annuity of £100, to be paid to him as long as he was obliged to remain in England. Feeling himself comparatively a wealthy man, M. Heude took a small house near Bristol, and invited M. Goudemetz to come and live with him. Mr. Meade, whom the latter consulted on the subject, advised him to accept, and at the end of July, 1796, he settled in his new home. The association only lasted seven

months, and in February, 1797, we find M. Goudemetz back in his garret at Pentonville. He remained on cordial terms with his late host, and continued to write to him regularly, but evidently they were not made to live in the close companionship of a *tête-à-tête*.

Only two months after his return to London, our Curé had the joy of receiving news from his family after a silence that had lasted four years. The letter that now reached him was mysteriously worded for the sake of prudence; the writers remembered the time when correspondence with an *émigré* priest entailed pain of death! Nevertheless, even this vague and unsatisfactory epistle bridged over the long interval of silence, and it encouraged M. Goudemetz to write to his two brothers who were at Heiligenstadt, near Mayence. It was evident at that time that the current of public opinion had set in in favour of the *émigrés*, and during the summer of 1797, our hero informed his French and English friends that he was about to return to France. In September, however, the Government of the Directoire issued fresh laws against the exiles, and, much disappointed, the good Curé writes to Mr. Meade: "God alone can say when we shall return!" He consoled himself by spending three months with his friends at Chatley, a property they had just bought in Somersetshire, and this long visit seems to have been a period of unalloyed enjoyment. The French priest was a favourite with all the members of this Protestant household. Mrs. Meade often asked his assistance when she had to write a letter requiring particular care. Mr. Meade consulted him about the improvements he intended to make in his newly-bought demesne. "It is not for your pleasure that I keep you here, but for mine," he used to say, when his guest expressed his fear of intruding on his hospitality. In the evenings, the children of the house used to dance, while the Curé played on the violin. Mr. Meade's friends made much of the exiled priest; we hear of Lord (?) Compton, who, having overtaken him when he was walking from London to Chatley, gave him a lift in his carriage; of Mr. and Mrs. Sawbridge, who, when he arrived at their house dripping wet, warmed, fed, and clothed him. The same kind friends sent him, after his return to London, what they modestly called "a few things." These proved an ample provision of clothes, linen, shoes, and the like. The good priest's delight on receiving these presents must have pleased the givers. He called in his *confrères* to exhibit his treasures, effusively

thanked his benefactors, not forgetting Mr. Meade, for, he says: "I do not forget that you are the cause of your friend's generosity . . . all this is done for your sake."

It speaks well for the kindness of M. Goudemetz' English friends that during his eight years' stay in England he had no occasion to spend a penny on his clothes.

The years 1798 and 1799 were saddened for our Curé by the loss of his two priest brothers, *émigrés* like himself; they died at Heiligenstadt, near Mayence, and this trial seems to have increased the survivor's desire to return to his own country and to his remaining relations.

In August, 1799, he writes that he and his colleagues believe that "deliverance is at hand." Some months later, he heard that churches had been opened in Paris, that many priests had resumed their functions, and that a funeral service had been celebrated in Artois for the repose of the souls of his brothers. Encouraged by these favourable symptoms, he began his preparations for leaving England. In October, 1800, he paid a farewell visit to the kind friends whose generous, considerate, and faithful affection had done so much to make his life not only bearable, but comparatively happy. He went on foot, as usual, from London to Chatley, and the family received him with more affection than ever. The children of the house seem to have been devoted to the kindly, cheerful priest, who, in a letter to a *confrère*, relates that the eldest boy, Richard, showed a decided leaning towards the Catholic faith. The incident upon which M. Goudemetz bases this opinion speaks volumes for the simple-mindedness of the good Curé. The boy one day asked his mother why their guest never eat meat on Fridays and Saturdays.

"Because his Church forbids him to do so," was the reply. "Then, mamma, I give you my word that henceforth I will do as he does and abstain from meat those two days," and [adds the writer], "he has so far kept his word."

Their children's love for their clerical visitor does not seem to have bred jealousy or distrust in the minds of the parents. On the contrary, being obliged to leave home, Mr. and Mrs. Meade left M. Goudemetz in charge of their household. Their confidence gave him pleasure, and he triumphantly informs M. de Bernage, one of his most constant correspondents, that not only had he the responsibility of the children, but also

the keys of the cupboards where the tea, sugar, and wine were kept.

You should have seen how [he adds], when seated at table surrounded by these young olive branches, I acted my part as father of a family.

Although so desirous of seeing his country and relations again, M. Goudemetz dreaded parting from the friends of his exile; he owns that he "shivered" at the thought. It had to come, however, for peace and liberty seemed at last sufficiently restored to make it a duty for the French priests who were still in England, to return to a country where their services were sorely needed. Mr. Meade agreed with this view, and on the 27th of November, 1800, M. Goudemetz left the hospitable home at Chatley, never to return.

On reaching London he found that to enter France was a more complicated matter than he had imagined, and some time still elapsed before he crossed the "silver streak" that separated him from his native land.

In the first place, a *promesse de fidélité* was required by the Government of all the priests who wished to exercise their ministry. Although the most enlightened of the French Bishops pronounced this promise to be perfectly lawful, and pointed out that it had nothing in common with the schismatical oath demanded in 1791, a certain number of timid and scrupulous priests raised doubts on the subject and their opinion made M. Goudemetz hesitate. Moreover, rumours were current to the effect that negotiations were pending between the Pope and the new ruler of France, Napoleon Bonaparte, and the members of the clergy who were attached to the Bourbons wondered how an agreement between Rome and the French Government might affect their position with regard to the latter.

It must be confessed that several royalist Bishops, personally devoted to the cause of Louis XVIII., seemed inclined to linger on in England as long as the "Usurper" was in power. In the end however, our Curé decided to start, a passport was delivered to him by the English Government at the recommendation of the Abbé de Maussac, Vicar General of Rouen, and he received from the Relief Committee a sum of ten guineas, which was what he would have received during six months' stay in England. At first, from motives of delicacy,

both M. Goudemetz and his travelling companion, M. d'Epinay, seemed inclined not to claim the money which the Committee was in the habit of bestowing on all departing priests; but their English friends advised them to take it and they eventually did so.

On May 24th, 1801, M. Goudemetz wrote to his relations to announce his arrival :

Let us sing *Lætamini* [he says], all obstacles have been removed, the wall of separation has been thrown down . . . let your joy be as unmingled and as great as mine !

Then he wrote carefully to all the friends of his exile, for in the midst of his natural happiness at the thought of going home, his kind and grateful heart was evidently moved by conflicting feelings of joy and sorrow. Mr. and Mrs. Sawbridge, Lord (?) Hencage (?), Mrs. Silburn, whom he calls *la mère des Français*, besides the French priests who were still in England, and whose companionship had brightened his life, each one of these received an affectionate and grateful letter. With a practical sense that was worthy of his Norman training, he afterwards collected all the unsold copies of his book and made them over to a tobacco merchant, who used them to wrap up parcels. This ingenious device brought him in eighteen shillings. Lastly, on the eve of his departure, he wrote to Mr. Meade, the friend to whom he owed the largest debt of gratitude. After informing him that, after many delays his return to France is at last settled, he says :

When I think of parting from you, my eyes fill with tears. These tears are caused by your boundless kindness. . . . What I am able to express on paper, I could not have expressed in words, if I judge by what I went through when I left Chatley.

He adds grateful and affectionate messages to Mrs. Meade, the children, the neighbours, and to a certain "Miss Ann and Co."

Next day, May 11th, 1801, after an exile of eight years, eight months, and four days, M. Goudemetz and his friend M. d'Epinay left England. They landed at Rotterdam and went together to Antwerp where they parted; our Curé going on to Arras, where he spent fifteen months among his relations. There are few towns in France where the Reign of Terror left its mark so deeply imprinted as at Arras, and M. Goudemetz

seems to have been painfully impressed by all he heard of the experiences of those terrible times. In 1802, he settled down once more to active work in his old diocese, not indeed at Cretot, but in the neighbouring parish of Sausseuzemare, to which Cretot had been annexed. The two parishes together numbered about 1,000 souls. After a break of ten years, our Curé resumed his life on much the same lines as under the old *régime*. After attending to his flock, he busied himself in his garden and devoted himself, as he used to do, to his endless correspondence and compilations. Many of his colleagues had returned to their posts in the neighbourhood, and among them the sociable and bright-tempered pastor of Sausseuzemare and Cretot was a general favourite.

Fourteen years of peaceful life had passed by when a visitor arrived whose advent created a pleasant flutter of excitement among the Norman Curés around Cretot. The visitor was Richard Meade, now a youth of twenty-three, fresh from Oxford, who came to spend some weeks with his father's old friend. All the neighbouring priests, most of whom had been acquainted with the Meade family, vied with each other in welcoming the young Englishman. From Normandy Richard Meade proceeded to Paris, where M. Goudemetz recommended him to his two nephews. Judging from a pleasant letter written in Latin by young Meade to his French friends, the young men were delighted with each other.

Three years later, our good Curé sent out pressing invitations to his neighbours to come and dine with him in honour of the birth of Richard Meade's first baby. In a letter to M. d'Epinay he explains that Richard, who was now an Anglican clergyman, had married "a young and deserving lady," who lately presented him with a fine boy.

To celebrate this happy event, I brought together all those who know the Rev. Richard Meade, and we drank the health of father, mother and child.

In 1818, Mr. Meade sent his old friend another visitor, a young man whom M. Goudemetz calls Lord Tucker. This youth remained several months at the presbytery to learn French, and after his departure, his host relates that a present of twelve silver spoons and forks was sent to him from England.

My house [he adds] is full of the presents that I receive continually from Mr. Meade, Lord Tucker, Mr. Sawbridge, and others.

In the last letter of the collection, dated October 17, 1821, we find an affectionate mention of Mr. Meade.

I have just received a letter [writes M. Goudemetz to his nephew] from the good and excellent Mr. Meade, who says: I hope that all the distant branches of your family are as well as your heart can wish.

After this we are deprived of any further information on the subject of the Curé's correspondence with his English friends. In 1821, M. Goudemetz had a slight attack of paralysis and, though he partially recovered, he no longer took the trouble to keep copies of his letters. However, his naturally robust health enabled him to fulfil his priestly duties till his death in 1826. To the last he said two Masses every Sunday, one at Cretot, the other at Sausseuzemare; he never had need to wear spectacles and was as cheerful, kind-hearted and sociable as ever. Only his walking powers were no longer equal to what they had been when he went so blithely from London to Chatley, and he was obliged to ask a younger *confrère* to visit the sick people of his straggling parishes.

We do not claim for the paper, which we here present to English readers, the deep interest that is attached to the memoirs of certain priests of the same epoch, whose field of action was wider or whose destiny was more tragic. The Abbé Carron, who founded the mission of Somers Hill; the heroic confessors, who suffered for the faith on the floating prisons of La Rochelle and l'île d' Aix; those again, who remained in France, in daily peril of death, in order to assist and comfort their afflicted flock, have a higher place in the admiration of posterity.

Nevertheless our Norman Curé is a sympathetic character: warm-hearted, grateful, with a fund of cheerful resignation characteristic of his nationality. It is pleasant to note the unbroken friendship that existed between him and his Protestant friends; if he did not bring them into the Church, he, at any rate, left among them the impression of a sweet-natured and conscientious priest, as estimable as he was loveable. The man who could give this impression at a period when Protestant prejudices were so inveterate, cannot be said to have wasted his time.

BARBARA DE COURSON.

On the Evolution of Art.

IN all ages art in one form or another appears to have been a constant accompaniment of civilization. The passage through antiquity of long-vanished civilizations is marked out to this day by the art-remains with which their course was strewn. And we possess no record of any civilization, however rudimentary, from which traces of artistic activity are absent. It seems that wherever the conditions of existence have been sufficiently favourable to exempt man from exclusive pre-occupation with material exigencies, his mental expansion has been invariably attended and registered by some effort at art-production. And so universal is this phenomenon among peoples the most diversely circumstanced—differing from one another in race, habits, and physical surroundings—as to justify the assumption that art fulfils some inherent requirement common to all thinking, feeling humanity, and that the genesis of the art-impulse is to be found in an instinctive endeavour to satisfy a definite, radical need of human nature.

Christian art is but one among many manifestations of the activity of this impulse, of which the arts of Greece, Mesopotamia, and Ancient Egypt are, historically, no less important examples. And widely as these different arts vary in such characteristics as result from the influence of environment, yet they all occupy, at corresponding periods of development, the same relative position towards the life of their respective civilizations and discharge the same function in them all. The differences, for example, that distinguish the bas-reliefs of Assyria from the wall-paintings of Egypt, the monumental sculpture of Pagan Greece from the pictorial achievement of Christian Europe, though differences of both character and kind, are yet but the outcome of differences in the thought, feeling, and physical conditions of the people who produced them; and underlying these exterior distinctions, we find that the relation of art to life—intellectual, emotional, and material

life—is the same in East and West, in ancient and in modern times. However diversely the art-impulse may be manifested, its origin may everywhere be traced to one uniform, initial motive in human nature; and its development is found to proceed through a uniform series of successive stages, of which the order is nowhere reversed. The history of the world's art is a book of many chapters, written in many divers tongues; but the narrative of each is an analogy of all—the record of a common effort making for a common goal, and pursuing a course which, though capable within fixed limits of many deviations, never changes its general direction.

Before entering upon the distinctive achievements of an art so highly specialized as that produced under the influence of Christianity, it will be of interest to inquire into the origin of the art-impulse considered as a force common to all humanity, and to note the general character of those successive phases which amidst all local particularizations, uniformly attend its evolution.

What then is the nature of that initial stimulus which first prompts man to art-production? With what end in view, for what purpose—if for any—does he first take chisel or brush in hand, or raise up his voice in song? Through what transitional changes, what altered perspective of aim do his first rude scratchings on stone and daubings on plaster gradually develop into the sculptural and pictorial creations of a Periclean or a Medicean age, and these in their turn give place to the empty and stereotyped formalism that everywhere—in Imperial Rome as in modern Europe—characterizes the decadence of art?

The question of the origin of art is one that at different times has met with many different answers, and that at all times has been a favourite subject of inquiry. Some older writers, arguing possibly from the insufficient data of examples representative of special phases of art only, have identified the art-impulse with man's instinct of imitation, prompting him to copy or reproduce in one way or another the forms and appearances of the world around him. Others, with more plausibility, have derived it from man's natural susceptibility to the physical effects of sight and hearing, leading him to surround himself with such objects and such sounds as will give pleasure to his eye or his ear, and inducing in him a love of ornament for its own sake. Others, again, have considered the art-impulse to be but the mental correlative of that desire for recreative activity

which in the domain of man's bodily energies is known as the "play-impulse." Viewed in this aspect, art is reduced to a kind of glorified sport; and although this theory may possibly account for some performances that have been carried on under the name of art, yet as a serious attempt to elucidate the origin of creative aspiration it is so obviously inadequate, as perhaps hardly to deserve mention. On the other hand, the general trend of modern criticism, possessed of all the cumulative evidence amassed by modern archeological research, starts from a diametrically opposed standpoint. Holding that the essential power of art lies in the capability to give concrete expression to ideas and emotions imperfectly conveyed by language, it identifies the art-impulse with an imperative need universally experienced by the composite nature of man to externalize, in an imagery palpable to his senses, his conceptions and sentiments regarding a super-sensuous world. Thus interpreted, art serves primarily as a link between the seen and the unseen; it originates as a figurative language addressed to the imagination, supplementing the intellectual language of words with the more vivid, potent, and immediate appeal of visible or audible form.

It will be seen that the several theories above indicated are divisible into two distinct classes—that which gives an objective, and that which gives a subjective, origin to art. And as these terms strike at the root of the present inquiry, it is necessary (before examining how far either theory is borne out by the witness of antiquity) to explain the precise sense in which they are here applied to art. Briefly, it may be said that by objective art is understood all art in which the main consideration is *form*; and by subjective art is understood all art in which the main consideration is *significance*. The first appeals chiefly, or even solely, to the eye or the ear; the second appeals through the eye or the ear to the imagination or the emotions. This definition will perhaps be clearer if supplemented by an illustration, which, for convenience sake, will be taken from one art alone.

For instance, an artist may paint an apple with no other purpose than to produce a likeness as exact as possible to the actual appearance of an apple, and to delude the eye by the accuracy and skill of his copy. This would be a simple example of *imitative* art, of which the sole concern is the reproduction of external appearances and effects, and which is exclusively preoccupied with form. Or again, he may from the study

of an apple with its crown of encircling leaves derive some ornamental scheme of lines and curves which shall have no other purpose than to please the eye by its beauty and grace. This would be an example of what, broadly speaking, may be called *decorative art*. And although, in this case, the elaboration of his design might entail some imaginative effort on the part of the artist, yet in so far as his aim is merely to gratify the eye by a pleasurable effect of form, his work would belong to that branch of objective art which makes the realization of external beauty its end.

On the other hand, an artist might introduce an apple into a picture as an emblem of the First Sin of man; and here, though he might legitimately strive both to make it appear like a real apple and to make it pleasing to look upon, his ultimate aim would be neither to deceive the eye by its illusive semblance of reality, nor to charm the eye by its beauty of effect, but to suggest to the mind the special moral significance with which he had invested it. This would be an example of *symbolic art* which, occupied primarily with things of the imaginative or the spiritual life, uses the object-world only as the depository of subjective meanings, and reproduces common-place forms not for their own sake, but for the sake of what, by an accepted convention, they denote.

And again, an artist may paint something he has never seen with his bodily eyes, something of which he has only a subjective knowledge—either as an invention of his own fancy, as a communicated idea or emotion, or as a narrated event,—which he apprehends only through imagination and sympathy. For example, he may paint the scene of the Expulsion from Eden, the garden planted by the Lord, the cherubic figure with flaming sword, the despair of our first parents. And in this case he will create from his imagination such forms as are apt in themselves to embody and make manifest the special qualities, physical and spiritual, that constitute his individual conception of his subject. Here the character of the form will be determined by and dependent upon, the nature of the idea of which it is required to be the visible incarnation, and to which it stands somewhat in the relation of body to soul. The objective and subjective elements will here be almost equipoised, the idea animating the form, the form manifesting the idea. This close union of idea and form is the goal towards which the growth of art

perpetually tends, and its attainment represents the climax of art development, namely—*creative*, or *expressive*, art.

Both these last instances belong to what is here called subjective art, for in both the artistic form is used to convey a super-sensuous meaning. The essential difference between the two instances may be thus defined: In symbolic art a subjective significance is arbitrarily attached to some object with which it need possess no radical connection, whereas in expressive art the ideal quality of the subject-matter becomes so intimately and vitally mingled with the sensuous quality of the form as to be henceforth inseparable from it. Symbolism implies duality—the sign and the thing signified being associated only by some accident of circumstance, by some partial resemblance, or by a correspondence like that of parallel lines which never meet; while expression, on the contrary, is the convergence of idea and form into the union of one complete whole.

In the history of art-production the different aims here contrasted as the imitative and decorative, the symbolic and expressive aims, have all at various times, both singly and in combination, played parts of varying importance. When combined together they to some extent counterbalance one another and become in practice less sharply distinctive than when verbally defined. A work primarily symbolical in character may be decorative or imitative in the form of the symbol employed. A work of which the chief aim is to produce an effect of decorative beauty may be and most frequently is, based upon some motive of natural beauty more or less imitatively represented. And in expressive art, the strivings to imitate, to embellish, and to reveal, unite in the supreme composite effort to express a noble idea in forms that shall please the eye, stimulate the imagination, and resemble nature,—in forms, that is, which are at once beautiful, creative, and true.

But although in an epoch of full development, all these several aims tend to co-operate as almost equally balanced forces, each contributing its special power to the attainment of a greater perfection, yet in the immature stages of growth that lead up to full development, as in the over-ripe stages of decline that lead down from it, we find that single aims successively preponderate, in turn exercising the influence of paramount impulses and following a regular sequence in the

order of their respective predominance. The initial motive that first quickens the life and stimulates the growth of art becomes exhausted when once the zenith of development is passed, and in the succeeding periods of slow decline is overcome and effaced by the force of other aims which originally served as its own subservient auxiliaries. This uniform transition of aim may be traced, amidst all particular modifications, through every great art of which we possess the full history, and is more or less clearly indicated in the broken records that as yet constitute all our knowledge of the arts of the ancient world.

As thus revealed by the comparative study of different arts, the general trend of art-evolution may be defined as a gradual passage from subjectivity to objectivity. All primitive artistic effort, whether it be that of early Christian art or early heathen art, is intensely subjective in character; while all late artistic achievement, whether it be that of decadent antiquity or decadent modernism, is (allowing for the vagaries of eclectic revivalism) purely objective in tendency.

The one point on which all examples of early art agree, however much they may differ in other respects, is the dominance of the symbolic aim. Whatever may have been the kind of art practised, whether stone-work or metal-work, pottery or painting; whatever may have been the character of the actual forms employed, whether they were derived directly from nature, or were based upon some fantastic combination, or were borrowed from the art of another nation—whether they were treated imitatively, as was to some extent the case in India; or decoratively, as was generally the case in Egypt; or conventionally, as was the case in Phœnicia;—in every case the form primarily served as a symbol, and was valued, not for the sake of what it was in itself, but for the sake of a subjective significance of which it was made the vehicle, an abstract conception or a mystical allusion of which it became the accepted sign. Whether we look to the cylinders of Chaldea, to the "whorls" of Troy, or to the steles of Asia Minor, to the sculptured reliefs of Indian cave-temples, or to the painted friezes of Egyptian tombs, to the obelisks of Assyria, the graven gems of Mycenae, the bowls and vases of Phœnicia, or the archaic wood *xoana* that heralded the statuary of Greece,—we find art everywhere preoccupied with a subject-matter that was none other than the problem of all existence—the wonder of

the visible creation, the mysteries of the origin of life, the destiny of humanity, and the nature of a supreme Divinity variously apprehended but universally acknowledged. We find everywhere the same use of the artistic image as the figure and the hieroglyphic of supernatural agencies, of creative energies, and divine attributes separately personified and deified; we find the same effort to typify in visible emblems the superhuman powers of a spirit-world intuitively discerned—in a word, we find the same entire subservience of the art-form to the religious idea.

Many of the prevailing forms of ancient art were adopted from natural objects, the things of nature seeming to furnish a ready-made symbol of the divine, invisible forces that lay behind the visible creation. Consisting largely of representations of animal and vegetable life, they involved some effort at imitative rendering; but the imitative aim rarely, if ever, went beyond the production of a more or less conventionalized type. When the subject lent itself to decorative treatment, there is occasional evidence, even in the oldest remains, of a conscious effort for and appreciation of ornamental effect. But in all early art the decorative aim, hardly less than the imitative, appears as a secondary, intermittent force uniformly subordinated, and often wholly sacrificed, to the requirements of a paramount symbolic intention.

For instance, to cite a few well-known examples, the lotus-flower which figured so largely in Egyptian and Indian art, though admirably adapted to decorative purposes, owed its introduction into both arts, not to its symmetry of form, which was often neglected, but to a particular idea associated with it. Alternately fading by night and expanding by day as the first sunbeams touched its petals, this strange flower of Eastern waters was regarded as a type of inexhaustible life, and by that tendency to correlate the physical and the spiritual which is characteristic of Eastern thought, it figured in the art of India as the symbol of supreme creative force, and in that of Egypt as the emblem of resurrection and regeneration. Analogous to the Flower of Life is the mysterious Tree of Life, which first appearing on the oldest cylinders of Chaldea, descended by right of inheritance (or conquest) to Assyrian art, where its ornamental possibilities were highly cultivated, and later passed into Persia and Phœnicia. Originally derived from some primeval date-palm, it was variously represented in different countries as sycamore, vine, pomegranate, and fig-tree; and in

Persia became identified with the sacred plant *Hom*, whose sap was believed to confer immortality, and which plays so important a part in the mystical doctrines of early Mazdeism. But however locally modified, it appears everywhere to have stood as a concrete sign of the abstract idea of fecundity, reproductivity, *life*; and as this idea was common to all conceptions of a life-giving deity, the Tree became in each country a symbol of its chief divinity—in Chaldea, of Baal; in Assyria, of Assur; in Phœnicia, of Astarte. The sun, again, as the most beneficent influence, and chief fertilizing agent in nature, the source of light, warmth, and physical well-being, and seeming in the daily wonder of its rising and setting, a living embodiment of celestial powers, enters as a constant motive in all ancient art—sometimes represented literally as a radiating globe, sometimes personified in a solar divinity, sometimes veiled under the figure of a variety of emblematic designs. In Persia the literal rendering was early superseded by personified representations of Mithras, the Sun-god, who, alternately reigning in the heavens by day and descending into the realms of darkness by night, was conceived of as the mediator between the lords of light and darkness, Ormuzd and Ahriman; and from his position of mediator and judge, was gradually identified with a supreme deity superior to both—Zervan, the absolute impersonal Unity that lay behind the personified Duality of the exoteric doctrine. In pantheistic India, where the whole of nature was considered as the visible manifestation of the creator—Brahmâ having merged his own identity in that of the creation he animated—a more imitative rendering prevailed (though India, too, had its sun-god in the person of Sourya). And here we not infrequently find sun, mountains, sea or rivers, trees and animals combined, round the central figures of divine personages, into scenes that seem to emulate some actual landscape effect. Yet every separate detail, every element introduced, has its special reference or dedication to particular aspects or attributes of divinity, and all are connected even more closely by the association of the ideas they represent than by their physical neighbourhood in any terrestrial prototype. For instance, mountains appear as an allusion to the golden Mount Cailasa, the mythic centre of the world, where on a jewelled table lay the Lotus, bearing within its calyx the Sacred Triangle, symbol of the Trinity in Unity, the source of all things. Seas are a reminiscence of that primeval ocean

of milk where Vishnu, second person of the Hindu Trinity, floated upon a lotus-leaf. Rocks and caverns, trees and plants, have each their special significance. The element of water, inestimable blessing in a land periodically rainless, was consecrated to Vishnu, the Preserver; while fire was sacred to the great god Siva, the third person of the Trimourti, the Regenerator, who destroyed that he might renovate. Animal life, too, which supplied such a very large proportion of the art-forms of all ancient nations, was invested, even apart from the dignity it acquired through the doctrine of transmigration, with a wide range of symbolic significance, both from its association with special divinities and as an imagery of special powers and ideas. To give only a few illustrations of a subject that is extremely complicated—in Indian art, the bull, the elephant, and the eagle are the favourite chargers of the gods, the first representing the idea of strength, the second that of strength and wisdom, the last that of strength and swiftness. The cow was an emblem of fecundity and maternity, and was often identified with Prakriti, the principle of mildness and goodness; the dog and the goose were emblems of vigilance; the serpent of health and life. All fish, as inhabitants of water, were sacred to Vishnu, as was also the tortoise, his second *avatar* or incarnation, and the bee. The gazelle, serpent, and tiger were dedicated to Siva, as was also the bull, by which he is sometimes represented.

This animal, throughout the East, was generally regarded as the type of vital force and muscular strength, and in the Mithraic myths of Persia figures as the symbol of the visible creation. The lion in Egypt and Assyria was associated with the idea of justice and judgment, and thence became an emblem of regal authority, which itself was often received as the temporal counterpart of divine omnipotence. In Greek art, the eagle took the place of the lion, and, in later days, became the emblem of imperial dignity. In Egypt, the hawk signified intelligence; the vulture, maternity; the jackal, watchfulness over holy things, and thus became a symbol of the priestly office. The *scarabeus*, or sacred beetle, was an emblem at once of the world, the sun, and celestial regeneration, while the serpent, according to its position, was variously regarded as the symbol of eternity, of health, and of wisdom, guile, and sin. A complete history of the symbolism of animals would fill many pages, for not only was each animal often invested in different countries with a

different significance, but in each country the same animal sometimes possessed a multiple significance according as it was variously employed as the type of a particular moral quality or physical power, as an emblem of a divine attribute, or as itself the incarnation of some special deified aspect of divinity. The main point for the present purpose is that the prominence given in antique art to animals was due to an extraneous significance arbitrarily attached to them.

An altogether different class of art-forms is to be found in such inventive designs or conventional devices as the Winged Globe of Egypt and Assyria—a composite symbol signifying both the sun and the supreme deity of which the sun itself was but a symbol; the Gammadion, or Fylfot, the Triscèle, the Wheel, the Disc, the Rosette—all solar emblems, of which the first two are considered to have been confined to the Aryan races; the *Crux ansata* of Egypt which, whatever may have been its origin, was the sign *par excellence* of life, and the symbol of immortality; the Footprint, that “vestige of presence,” originally applied to Vishnu, and afterwards adopted as a token of the passage of Buddha; the Triangle, which, as typifying the union of the vivifying with the producing principle, was the chief Hindu symbol of the unity of the First creative Cause; the Sacred Cone of Phœnicia; the Indian Trisula; the Greek Caduceus; and the Trident which, discovered in the oldest Chaldean cylinders, has appeared in almost every ancient art as the emblem of lightning, and the attribute of an avenging deity. These and similar devices, rudely and roughly executed, are to be found in many of the oldest remains of antique art, and thus may be said to represent man's earliest known attempts at artistic design, his first efforts to give form to his conceptions of his relation to a Creator. And it is of extreme interest to note that many of the most exquisite ornamental patterns and decorative designs of a much later period when art was frankly dedicated to purely objective and decorative purposes, were directly derived and elaborated from these ancient religious symbols which had originally enshrined the deepest meanings of pre-Christian religious contemplation.

We now come to another class of art-forms which to some extent combines the two classes already mentioned, namely, that in which forms originally derived from nature are intentionally *denaturalized* by monstrous combinations or by the fantastic addition of abnormal features for the deliberate

purpose of expressing supernatural qualities and powers. Though still symbolic in character, this class in so far as it implies the endeavour to *adapt* the external form into some evident harmony with the indwelling idea rather than to *invest* an object with an idea apparently extraneous to it, marks the point at which symbolism first extends towards creative embodiment, where the effort to *denote* is first superseded by the effort to *express*. To this class belong the many-handed idols of India, the winged quadrupeds with human heads that represent the genii of Assyria and the cherubim of Mesopotamia, the human figures with animal heads that typify the combined powers of the gods of Egypt. In these unnatural and monstrous shapes we find the same effort to give visible embodiment to the manifold attributes of an Almighty divinity, by the incongruous combination of particular powers to realize the idea of omnipotence, and by overstepping the boundaries of the natural and the normal to attain the supernatural and the absolute. And gross and repellent as these forms frequently are, they yet acquire a certain dignity as representing the constant striving of unenlightened humanity to get outside the limits of its own existence to that Infinite *Beyond* which is the goal alike of all mysticism in religion, and all symbolism in art. Viewed in this aspect the whole achievement of primitive ancient art, as far as we know it, is but a visible chronicle of man's ceaseless wanderings, amidst pitfalls of sense and mirages of spirit, in quest of a godhead in whose Being, still unrevealed though universally unquestioned, he should find the Alpha and Omega of his own existence, the source of his life, the destiny of his soul.

And so close is the association between the arts and the religions of antiquity that it is impossible to study either without reference to the other. The forms of ancient art are incomprehensible without a knowledge of the religious beliefs of the people who produced them. And a most important, if not indeed the chief, source of our information concerning the religions of antiquity lies in the broken records of religious belief and aspiration which are enshrined in the fragmentary remains of antique art. Throughout the ancient world art and religion stand in a relation of interdependence bound inextricably together by the all-powerful link of symbol. The earliest language spoken by art was the language of symbol; the first subject treated by art was everywhere identical with

that which throughout the ages has been the subject of religious contemplation and religious ecstasy; and the original mission of art was to give utterance by a sign, since all words were inadequate, to the unspeakable wonder and awe with which man surveys the mystery of Creator and creation.

Thus in answer to our initial inquiry, it may be said that the origin of the art-impulse lies in an irresistible outward pressure of the religious impulse, in an imperative need of the spirit of man to find some external vent and some mode of transmission for its own most sacred imaginings.

Every great art of antiquity can be traced to its origin in this need of the religious impulse to externalize itself in tangible, palpable form, the need for some outward, visible sign of an inward spiritual significance, the need for an appeal *par les sens à l'esprit* which seems to be an instinctive necessity of the whole human race. And, similarly, every great religion of antiquity called into being its corresponding art as the supplement of its sacred writings, to give expression to all that overflow of religious imagination which escaped definition in words, and also as offering the most effectual means of widespread, popular appeal. Thus employed, art stands to doctrinal definition in somewhat the same relation that feeling stands to thought. It can embrace all those more mystical and emotional aspects of religious aspiration that elude the grasp of language, while, at the same time, it addresses itself forcibly and immediately, in the terms of a visible imagery, to the vast unlettered multitude to whom the Sacred Books would be both inaccessible and unintelligible.

At first sight, it may appear that two very important exceptions to the above generalizations vitiate the conclusion here drawn from them. Under the divinely-instituted Law of Moses, as under the fanatic rule of Mahomet, all imagery of the Deity was strictly forbidden. But although in the two great religious systems of the Semitic race, the divine Personality was not portrayed in art, the feeling of mankind towards Divinity, and his conception of his relation towards his Creator, found an all-powerful artistic expression. The same outlet for the religious imagination, the same externalization of the emotional and spiritual elements of the religious idea, that Egypt, Mesopotamia, India, and Greece found mainly in the plastic arts, Israel and Islam found in the arts of tone and rhythm. The allusions in the Old Testament to music, song,

and dancing are far too numerous for exhaustive quotation; but to mention a few instances, we read in Exodus xv. how Moses and the children of Israel sang unto the Lord in thanksgiving for their deliverance from the Egyptians, and "Mary the prophetess, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went forth after her with timbrels and with dances," in 2 Kings vii. how when David and the men of Juda took the Ark from the house of Abinadab they "played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of wood, on harps and lutes and timbrels, and cornets and cymbals," how David "danced before the Lord" and brought the Ark into his own city "with joyful shouting and the sound of trumpet;" in 2 Paralipomenon vi. how when Solomon brought the Ark into the Temple, both the Levites and the singing men sounded together with trumpets and voice, and cymbals and organs, and with divers kinds of musical instruments, and lifted up their voice on high; and, not to multiply examples needlessly, the whole Book of the Psalms is but a series of songs concluding with the injunction to "praise the Lord with sound of trumpet, with psaltery and harp, . . . with timbrel and choir, . . . with strings and organs, . . . on high-sounding cymbals, . . . on cymbals of joy, let every spirit praise the Lord." These and many other analogous passages of Scripture contain an explicit sanction given by the divinely-appointed leaders of the Chosen People to the expression of religious sentiment in the art-forms of music and dancing.

And similarly the sons of Islam found a spontaneous vent for their religious enthusiasm (or frenzy) in the strange weird music on pipes and drums, in the rhythmical swaying movements and fantastic dances that even to this day accompany all their most solemn religious rites. An analysis of the inherent affinity existing between particular races and particular arts, of the reason why the Semitic races should be instinctively drawn to the arts of tone and rhythm while the Aryan races tend more naturally to the plastic arts—though a subject of extreme and intricate interest, is beyond the scope of the present article, which is confined to indicating the need uniformly manifested by all races to express religious sentiment in artistic form. In the one case the mode of expression chosen was fugitive, the inspiration of a moment, transitorily communicated, and ceasing as the moment passed; in the other it was permanent, an impulse transmitted and perpetuated through the centuries.

But in both cases, there is the same recourse to art, the same intervention of the artistic medium as the vehicle of the religious idea.

In a subsequent article it will be our endeavour to show, firstly—how the forms originally employed only as the token and the evocation of deep and sacred meanings, gradually grew and developed till the power of their external beauty and sensuous charm overwhelmed the spiritual significance they enshrined, till the mode of expression became so perfected as to be valued more than the quality of the thing expressed, and the symbolic aim, after becoming more or less absorbed in the expressive, was eventually superseded by the objective aims of decorative effect and imitative skill; secondly—how this process of evolution which may be traced even in the most conservative and (so-called) stationary arts of antiquity, is clearly manifested in the rise, development, and decadence of Christian art.

Our Popular Devotions.

IV.—BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

II.—EXPOSITION.

BLESSED DOROTHEA, the recluse of whom I spoke at the conclusion of my last article, died in 1394. Her Life was written by her confessor John Marienwerder, who was also editor of certain religious treatises which were composed from her revelations. In one of these, the *Septililium*, a special section was given to the Blessed Eucharist, towards which the holy recluse had an extraordinary devotion. The second chapter is headed, "That the Spouse of Christ had an intense desire both to receive and to behold the Sacrament of the Eucharist." Herein we read as follows :

Attracted by the fragrance of this life-giving Sacrament, the Spouse from her childhood until death had an intense longing to see the Sacred Host, and if in one day she saw It a hundred times, as on some occasions actually happened, she lost nothing of her craving to see It yet oftener. For her eyes were not sated with seeing the Body of Christ, just as her ears were not sated with hearing the Word of God. And along with this desire of seeing the Body of Christ there went always the desire of receiving It sundry times in the year. From the age of eleven she would fain have received seven times in the year, but in those days of childhood she was not allowed to make her Communion more than twice. When she had grown up, and her longing increased, she was allowed to go seven times in the year and sometimes oftener—this was while she remained in the married state.

The writer goes on to say that, on account of this longing for the Eucharist, she often passed sleepless nights :

Hence she was anxious to arrange how she might get to the church at a very early hour in the morning, so that she might have sight of this Beloved One of her soul, at any rate from the priests who said the early Masses. Sometimes, however, it happened that she was rapt in

ecstasy before the time for the Elevation came, and she remained in this until the Elevation was over, and on those occasions she did not see the Host, though with most fervent longing she desired to do so.¹

Turning to the Life of the Saint written by her director, we learn that when she was living near Dantzic, in her great eagerness to behold the Sacrament, she at first went to hear the Masses in the churches of the town, but though they began at daybreak, they were not early enough for her. Accordingly she betook herself to a little chapel outside the city and dedicated to Corpus Christi, "in order that there she might gaze on the Body of Christ which used to be kept there open to view in a monstrance, and in this way might somewhat cool the ardour of her desire."² Neither was this the only church in the neighbourhood where such a thing was heard of, for during the time of the plague she was induced to visit a little chapel of St. Gertrude still nearer to her home, where it was stated that the Blessed Sacrament was also openly reserved in a monstrance. She went as directed, but as she knelt to adore the Host, she received a supernatural intimation that the particle which she saw there was not consecrated, and this on inquiry proved to be the case. It seems tolerably clear then that about the year 1380, a fashion was growing up in certain parts of Germany of reserving the Blessed Sacrament visibly in an open monstrance, probably to satisfy the devotion of the faithful who came to gaze upon It. We might perhaps have hesitated to believe that this conclusion was justified, but the matter is placed beyond a doubt by various Provincial Councils, notably that held at Cologne in 1452, under the presidency of Cardinal Nicholas de Cusa, in which the practice of using these monstrances for the custody of the Blessed Sacrament is expressly forbidden.³

¹ *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. iii. pp. 409, 410. In the German version this section is headed *Das dy Gotis hungerige Dorothea hatte grosse begerunge zu seen und zu essen das hochwirdige Sacrament des leichnams unsirs hern.*

² "Ideo ipsa desiderio impacienti solebat ire ad ecclesiam Corporis Christi quæ est ante oppidum Gdantz ante diluculum ut videret ibi Eucharistiæ Sacramentum quod aperte in una monstrancia ibi servabatur, et sic fervorem sui desiderii in aliquo refrigeraret." (*Acta Sanctorum*, Oct. vol. xiii. p. 531.)

³ "Item ad majorem honorem sanctissimi Sacramenti statuimus, quod deinceps ipsum sanctissimum Sacramentum, nullatenus visibiliter in quibuscunque monstrantiis ponatur aut deferatur nisi in sanctissimo festo Corporis Christi cum suis octavis," &c. (Hartzheim, *Concilia Germania*, vol. v. p. 416.) I think also that there can be no question that the decree passed in the previous year, 1451, at the Synod of Mainz, and entitled *De Ostensione Eucharistia*, is directed against the same abuse. By some oversight, however, the word *monasteriis* has been printed for *monstranciis* in the

To the greater honour of the most holy Sacrament, we ordain [says the Council] that in future this most holy Sacrament must on no account be placed or carried open to men's view in any sort of monstrances save on the most holy festival of Corpus Christi and during the octave.

This ordinance has been referred to by some writers, *e.g.*, by Thiers,¹ as the earliest decree on the subject, but a similar pronouncement much nearer the time of the Blessed Dorothea, just referred to, may be cited from the Council of Breslau, held in 1416.² The decree is so interesting in the present connection as to deserve to be cited in full.

§ III. REGARDING THE EXPOSITION OF THE EUCHARIST.

Although in time past permission has been granted by us to sundry persons, both secular and regular, and for certain places, in the hope of increasing devotion, that on some few days of the week the Sacrament of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, that living and saving pledge of our eternal heritage, should be visibly exposed and shown to public view, (still) since from this frequent exposition, as we have perceived, the indevotion of the multitude only becomes greater, reverence is lessened, charity grows cold, and, as the dangers of neighbouring districts warn us, we have even to fear the growth and propagation of heresies in consequence, perceiving that what we granted as a means of salvation is tending rather to the hurt of souls, we now, being better advised, withdraw the permission given, and since the authority of the Holy Fathers has ruled, that after the celebration of Mass this Most Holy Sacrament ought not to be reserved, save only for the use of the sick and the dying; for fear that, as happened in the figure when God rained down manna from heaven to our fathers in the desert; so also now, the species of this Sacrament, if put away for another day, may in some sense putrify and grow corrupt, we for these reasons command and enjoin that no one of the clergy in future, whether secular or regular, as he dreads God's judgments, when once the solemn rites of the Mass are accomplished (the feast of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the occasion of some special commemoration of the same Sacrament being alone excepted) shall presume to expose, exhibit, and reserve this most venerable Sacrament, otherwise than for the use of the sick, under such penalties as belong to the rebellious and contumacious, the which all transgressors are hereby warned by our synodal authority that they will incur and fall

clause, "*Sacramentum visibiliter in monstranciis deferri.*" (Hartzheim, *ib.* p. 408.) Similar decrees dealing with the same abuse were issued in the Synod of Passau, 1470 (Hartzheim, *ib.* p. 486), and in that of Schwerin, 1492. (Hartzheim, *ib.* p. 646.)

¹ *Traité de l'Exposition du S. Sacrement*, vol. i. p. 236.

² Hartzheim, *Concilia Germania*, vol. v. pp. 153, 154.

under *ipso facto*. We do not, however, wish to prevent those of the clergy who desire to show a particular devotion to this life-giving Sacrament, from celebrating and singing Mass in honour of the Sacrament, provided It be not publicly exposed or unveiled.

How long before this date the practice of anything like exposition may have existed in the Church does not seem easy to determine. The Abbé J. B. Thiers¹ has discussed at some length the question, whether Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament is derived from the procession of the same, or whether the procession itself sprang from the exposition. He inclines to the former view, and it seems at any rate clear that the latter is quite untenable. The practice of carrying the Blessed Sacrament in procession, even if this can not strictly be called a procession of the Blessed Sacrament, may be traced in the Palm Sunday ceremonies as early as the time of Lanfranc,² and not very much later we find the Blessed Sacrament buried along with the cross on Good Friday in the "sepulchre," to be exhumed more or less triumphantly in that liturgical drama of Easter Sunday morning of which we have preserved an annual reminder in the sequence *Victimæ Paschali* of our present Missal.³ There seems, however, no reason to think that in any of these cases the Blessed Sacrament was exposed to view. Lanfranc directs, that in the Palm Sunday processions two priests vested in albs should carry a portable shrine (*feretrum*) in which also the Body of our Lord ought to be deposited (*in quo et Corpus Christi esse debet reconditum*). This language seems distinctly to exclude the idea of any sort of exposition in an open monstrance, and we should have to draw a similar inference from the terms in which the *Sarum Consuetudinarium* ascribed to St. Osmund, but belonging in its present form to about 1225, refers to the same ceremony. "Whilst the blest branches are being distributed," says this document, "a shrine shall be prepared with relics, from which the Body of the Lord shall be suspended in a pyx."⁴ No doubt one finds mention in mediæval records of transparent pyxes of glass or crystal, but from an inventory of the church plate at Salisbury, dated 1222, it seems clear that at this period nothing

¹ *Traité de l'Exposition du S. Sacrement de l'Autel*, Bk. ii. ch. 1.

² See Migne, *P.L.* vol. 150, p. 456. Lanfranc died in 1089.

³ Cf. Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, vol. i. p. 65; and Coussemaker, *Drames Liturgiques*, passim; Migne, *P.L.* vol. 147, p. 139.

⁴ *Register of St. Osmund* (Rolls Series), i. 120.

of the sort was used for the Blessed Sacrament.¹ The same Consuetudinary helps us, I think, to date the introduction at Salisbury of the rite of placing the Body of the Lord in the Easter sepulchre along with the crucifix. We possess two ancient manuscript copies of the treatise *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis*. One is found in a codex unquestionably of the thirteenth century, still preserved among the episcopal muniments at Sarum. The other is a copy which professes to have been made for the use of Henry de Loundres, who was Bishop of Dublin from 1213 to 1228, and which consequently represents a text necessarily earlier than 1228. Now in this second copy² there is no mention of the removing of the Blessed Sacrament from the Easter sepulchre, though the Treasurer's rules, which are practically identical in both copies, require him on Good Friday, "after the Body of the Lord has been laid in the sepulchre," to provide two candles of half a pound weight at least, to burn all day long before the sepulchre, while one such candle is to be kept lighted before the sepulchre all night and during the next day until the Easter Sunday procession.³ It seems difficult to suppose that the omission I have noted in the Dublin manuscript is accidental, so that we may probably infer that this copy was made before this part of St. Osmund's treatise at Sarum had been properly corrected to suit the new rite.

While therefore it is clear that processions *with* the Blessed Sacrament can be traced back to the eleventh century, it is by no means easy to determine at what epoch processions of the Blessed Sacrament in our sense, *i.e.*, processions in which the Blessed Sacrament as the central feature was exposed to the gaze of all, first took their rise. In the account furnished by Matthew Paris of Simon, Abbot of St. Albans from 1166 to 1183, who was a friend of St. Thomas of Canterbury, we have a full description of a costly ark-shaped vessel elaborately ornamented with enamels representing scenes of the Passion, which he presented

¹ *Ib.* ii. 137.

² "Processio ante matutinas in die Paschæ. In die Paschæ ante matutinas duo excellentiores presbiteri in superpelliceis [prius incensato sepulchro cum magna veneratione, Corpus Dominicum super altare deponant; deinde] crucem de sepulchro tollant." (*Register of St. Osmund*, Rolls Series, vol. i. p. 134.) The words within brackets are not found in the Dublin copy.

³ *Ib.* vol. i. p. 10. It may be noted as a matter of curiosity that the Wells' statutes of somewhat later date, strictly follow in both these particulars the Consuetudinary of Sarum. (See Reynolds, *Wells Cathedral*, p. 32.)

to the monastery,¹ and it seems to be suggested that on occasion of this gift the practice was introduced at St. Albans of carrying the Blessed Sacrament in the Palm Sunday procession, the precious casket so presented being used for the purpose. The description given by Matthew Paris of this element of the ceremony is worth quoting entire :

And in order to perpetuate his memory with benediction he (Simon) decreed that on Palm Sunday the Body of the Lord should be reverently placed in this shrine, and be carried by one of the brethren, venerable for character as well as for age, clothed in a white chasuble, to a pavilion erected in the churchyard, and composed of the most precious stuffs, unless the inclemency of the weather should prevent it. Thence It should be carried to the chapter-house, two of the brethren in copes honourably supporting the arms of him who carried the shrine. In the same manner, followed by the procession, It should at length be carried back to the church with the greatest veneration. And this is done that the faithful may see with what honour the Most Holy Body of Christ should be treated, which at this season offered Itself to be scourged, crucified, and buried.²

It seems clear from the description of Abbot Simon's casket that the Blessed Sacrament deposited in it was not exposed to view, and the same conclusion is suggested by such other allusions to these early Palm Sunday and Paschal processions that I have been able to meet with. The notices are for the most part of the briefest and do not tell us much, but there is at least nothing positive to suggest that in the twelfth or even in the thirteenth century the Blessed Sacrament was carried unveiled. To take one illustration, the thirteenth century Resurrection play of Kloster Neuburg, an interesting specimen of the early liturgical drama, begins with the following rubric : "In the holy night (of Easter), before the bell is rung for Matins, the Superior, taking with him some of the brethren, shall remove the Body of the Lord and the cross from the sepulchre, with devotion and reverence, sprinkling and worshipping them,

¹ "Idem Abbas Simon unum vas mirificum, per modum scrinii compositum (cujus arcam schema quadrat venustissimum : culmen vero per modum feretri surgendo coartatur, et undique circulis elevatis orbiculatur, in quibus historia Dominicæ Passionis imaginibus fusilibus figuratur et per totum laminis ductilibus solidæ spissitudinis, ita, scilicet, quod basibus vel sustentaculis ligneis non indiget) Deo et ecclesiæ S. martyris Albani . . . contulit fabricatum." (*Gesta Abbatum*, Rolls Series, i. p. 191.)

² *Gesta Abbatum S. Albani* (Rolls Series), vol. i. p. 192. I have availed myself of Father Bridgett's translation of this passage. (*History of the Eucharist*, vol. ii. p. 241.)

and singing in hushed tones the responsory, *Surrexit pastor bonus qui posuit animam suam pro ovibus suis.*"¹

A more reliable indication than this negative language is probably furnished by the eucharistic vessels of early date. So far as I have been able to examine the rather scarce inventories of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, we find nothing at this period of the nature of a monstrance. Of the Sarum inventory, 1222, I have already spoken. The inventories of St. Paul's, London, though descending into great detail, are equally silent, and this silence is the more noteworthy when we contrast it with "the cross of crystal to put the Body of Christ in and to carry It upon the feast of Corpus Christi and at Easter, with a crown of silver gilt beneath it, studded with many pearls," which is described in the inventory of the same Cathedral in 1402.² So, again, in the early inventories of Angers and Rouen,³ there is nothing in the details of the eucharistic vessels described, to suggest the showing of the Sacred Host to the people. Thus, at Angers, in 1286, we read only of a covered cup of silver gilt to carry the Body of the Lord: *cupa cooperta argentea aurata ad portandum corpus Domini*, whereas in 1505 we have an elaborate description of the "silver gilt vessel with two angels supporting a cross upon which rests a lunette of gold, in which the Sacred Host is wont to be enshrined upon the feast of the Consecration of the Body of the Lord."⁴ This famous monstrance had been given to the Cathedral by Louis II., King of Sicily, at the beginning of the fifteenth century; and various descriptions have been left of it down to the time of its disappearance in the French Revolution. I may note, *en passant*, that in England, before the Reformation, a preference seems to have been shown by our great churches for the form of monstrance which reproduces the figure of our Lord, the Sacred Host being inserted behind a crystal door in the breast. This, at least, was the case at Durham, Lincoln, and other famous cathedrals. Such vessels, however, seem to have been of comparatively late date.

Approaching the same problem from another side, the question also arises as to what degree of antiquity may be

¹ E. Du Ménil, *Theatri Liturgici Monumenta*, p. 89. Cf. the *Office du Sépulture d'Origny*.

² *Archæologia*, vol. I. pp. 464 and 514, and Dugdale's *Monasticon* (First Edition), vol. iii.

³ *Revue de l'Art Chrétien*, 1881 and 1886.

⁴ *Revue de l'Art Chrétien*, vol. xxxii. (1881), p. 181.

assigned to the earliest specimens of mediæval monstres preserved to our own days. It is not easy to speak with absolute certainty, but there can be no doubt, I think, that some very inaccurate statements may be found in the books generally appealed to. Even such authorities as Viollet Le Duc,¹ and still more recently, Professor F. X. Kraus in his still unfinished *Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst*,² have assigned much too late a date for the first appearance of this form of eucharistic vessel. Without speaking positively as to the alleged representation of such an object in the twelfth century fresco which adorns the apse of S. Ambrogio at Milan, the evidence in favour of the existence of at least some monstres in the second half of the thirteenth century seems too strong to be easily set aside. Of course there is danger of mistaking a certain form of reliquary for an eucharistic monstrance—it is not always easy to distinguish the one from the other—moreover, blunders may also have been made by mediæval workmen in cutting inscriptions, and archæologists are not infallible in dating goldsmiths' work from the intrinsic evidence of style and ornamentation. But making all allowances, it seems impossible to resist the cumulative effect of many different claims which cannot all be unfounded. Perhaps the most conclusive instance is that of an hexagonal tower-shaped vessel from the Abbey of Herckenrode, which is surmounted by a crucifix and small statues, and which bears the following inscription :

Anno dñi M^{CC}LXXXVI^r fecit istud vas fieri dña Heilewigis de Dist priorissa in Herckenrode cuius commoracio in perpetuū cum fidelibus habeatur.³

It seems scarcely possible that this could have been intended for a reliquary. Again, there is an octagonal monstrance at Bari in Italy, which is said unquestionably to belong to the thirteenth century, and the purpose for which it was intended is in this case made clear by the words, *Hic Corpus Domini*.

¹ *Mobilier Français*, vol. ii. p. 135: "L'usage de l'ostensoir, tel que nous le connaissons aujourd'hui n'est pas très ancien et ne remonte pas au delà du XV^{ème} siècle."

² Professor Kraus assumes that Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament *must* have originated with the Corpus Christi procession, of which procession we have no certain evidence earlier than 1316, and that consequently the introduction of eucharistic monstres must be later than this date. "Diesen Zwecken dienten die Monstranzen die selbstverständlich erst nach 1316 aufkommen." (Kraus, *Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst*, vol. ii. p. 472.)

³ Reussens, *Archéologie Chrétienne*, ii. p. 334.

Of fourteenth century monstrances there is no lack. It is interesting to note that one of this date, eighteen inches in height, and made, like most early specimens, to contain a cylindrical vessel of glass or crystal, is still preserved in the treasury of Dantzic, the home, it will be remembered, of St. Dorothea. Others of the same type may be found engraved in various publications on Christian art;¹ while some curious information on this topic is contained in the second volume of Corblet's *Histoire Dogmatique, &c., de la Sainte Eucharistie*. The huge size of some of the Spanish monstrances, e.g., at Toledo, Seville, and Barcelona, standing ten or twelve feet high, weighing almost a ton and often studded with jewels, is particularly remarkable.

The earliest unequivocal monstrance for use with the Blessed Sacrament of which I have as yet found any trace in written documents was bequeathed by Archbishop Robert Courtenay, who died in 1324, to his Cathedral Church of Rheims. It is referred to in the necrology of the Church of Rheims, under date March 3rd, in the following terms:

On this day died Robert de Courtenay, Archbishop of Rheims, who bequeathed to us three mitres, three crosses with staves covered with silver, a golden cross with precious stones and a crystal in the middle in which is placed the Body of Christ, and it is carried (in procession) upon the feast of the Most Holy Sacrament, &c.²

Next in date to this, and possibly even earlier, is a "monstrance of silver gilt with a crystal (face)" (*monstrancia argentea deaurata cum crystallo*) given to the church of Mainz by John of Trier, who died in 1349. It was to be used for the Easter sepulchre, as also on Corpus Christi, and "in the other processions in which the Body of Christ is wont to be carried for special needs." As John of Trier was already Archdeacon of Mainz in 1319, it is possible that the gift is of still earlier date.³

¹ See e.g., the *Zeitschrift für Christliche Kunst*, 1889, p. 153; 1890, p. 323; 1891, pp. 145, 146, &c.; Cahier et Martin, *Mélanges*, i. pl. 18; Otte; Reussens, &c.

² "Obiit Robertus de Courtenayo, Archiepiscopus Remensis, qui nobis legavit tres mitras, tres cruces cum baculis coopertis de argento, crucem auream cum lapidibus pretiosis et crystallo in medio in qua ponitur Corpus Christi et portatur in festo S. Sacramenti." Although the entry is taken from the latest of the three necrologies, this is itself earlier than 1400, and there can be no reasonable doubt of its accuracy. (Varin, *Archives Législatives de la Ville de Reims*, i. p. 71.)

³ I borrow these details from an extremely interesting account of the Corpus Christi procession in Mainz, c. 1400, published in the current (June, 1901) number of *Der Katholik*. For a Westminster monstrance of 1387, see *Archæologia*, vol. lii. p. 285.

To return however to the main point, it seems difficult to believe that the practice of exposing the Blessed Sacrament to public view depended in any direct way upon the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi. I should rather be inclined to say that the general and rapid popularity of the processions of the Blessed Sacrament which became the distinctive feature of that feast, was due to the same cause which later on produced the custom of exposing the Blessed Sacrament unveiled upon the altar. We may trace, it seems to me, three successive waves of devotional feeling in the later middle ages, all closely bound up with the eager desire of the faithful to look with their eyes upon the Body of the Lord. Each of them is important because they have all left their mark indelibly on our Catholic Church ceremonial.

First, the general acceptance of the practice of elevating the Sacred Host so as to show It to the people after the Consecration, which usage beginning in the latter half of the twelfth century, had become almost universal before the year 1250. Of this I have spoken sufficiently in my last article.

Secondly, the introduction and wide prevalence of processions on Corpus Christi day, in which the Sacred Host was carried in an open monstrance. Although the celebration of a festival in honour of the Blessed Sacrament was sanctioned at the prayer of Blessed Juliana as early as 1246 by the Bishop of Liège, and was confirmed by a Bull of Urban IV. in 1264, there seems to be no evidence that the day was at first celebrated with processions.¹ It was not until the Council of Vienne and the decree of John XXII. after 1316, that we have any direct evidence of the Blessed Sacrament being carried through the streets at this time, and we do not even then know for certain that It was carried unveiled. But the custom grew very rapidly, and there is every reason to connect with it the quickly spreading use of transparent monstrances. Nowhere did this celebration establish itself more securely than in England. Among the records of Ipswich we have an elaborate constitution for the Corpus Christi procession drawn up in the

This vessel, which was described as *unam grandem cupam de berilla*, is said to be called "a nooster" in an inventory of 1540. Surely this is a misreading of "moustre" or "monstre."

¹ Apart from the negative evidence that nothing is said of processions in the Pope's Bull, a consuetudinary of the Cathedral of Liège itself, belonging to the latter part of the thirteenth century, contains no reference to any procession on Corpus Christi.

year 1325, at the instance of the Gild Merchant bearing that dedication.¹

At Coventry pageants and plays were enacted in connection with the Corpus Christi procession as early as 1334.² At Cambridge a Corpus Christi gild already existed before the Black Death in 1349, and it was the desire to educate an adequate supply of priests to sing Mass for the souls of the departed brethren of this and another gild which led to the foundation of Corpus Christi College.³ The splendid collections of texts of the Corpus Christi plays enacted at York and Wakefield belong to the same century.

In Southern Europe, the progress made, at any rate so far as related to the dramatic aspects of the celebration, seems to have been more tardy,⁴ and it was only in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, under Lope de Vega and Calderon, that the *autos sacramentales* reached their supreme development in Spanish literature. On the other hand, at Prague, in Bohemia, we already find conciliar enactments levelled in 1366 at the *ludi theatrales* in the Corpus Christi procession.⁵ But if any attempt were made here to discuss Corpus Christi usages, we should fill a volume.

Thirdly, we have the movement now more immediately under discussion, which found an incentive to devotion in the continued exposition of the Blessed Sacrament unveiled. This does not seem to have manifested itself very vigorously before the close of the fourteenth century, and even then I have not been able to trace it outside Germany. Still a few isolated examples may have existed at an earlier period. There is, for instance, a wooden tower with windows of tinted glass, a work of the thirteenth century, which Viollet le Duc has figured in his *Mobilier*. The inscription, *Qui manducat hunc panem vivet in æternum*, suggests clearly that it was used as an eucharistic

¹ *Ninth Report, Historical MSS. Commission*, Appendix, p. 245. Cf. Gross, *Gild Merchant*, i. pp. 118, 119, ii. 125. The account does not let us know whether the Blessed Sacrament was carried in an open monstrance. The vessel was called *tabernaculum*, and belonged to the Gild, but *tabernaculum* might quite well mean a transparent vessel. The words are: "cum tabernaculo nostro huic processioni specialiter deputato in quo sacramentum Christi Corporis et Sanguinis continebitur."

² Ten Brink, *History of Eng. Literature* (Eng. Trans.), ii. p. 281.

³ Bass Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, i. p. 249.

⁴ See Pedrosó's Introduction to his collection of *Autos Sacramentales*; Menendez Pelayo, *Calderon*; Alessandro d'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro Italiano*, vol. i. p. 211; and Günthner, *Calderon und seine Werke*, vol. ii. p. 301.

⁵ Höfler, *Concilia Pragensia*, p. 13; Creizenach, *Geschichte des Neueren Dramas*, i. p. 171.

tabernacle. I am inclined to think that the windows were designedly intended to afford a view of the Sacred Hosts which reposed within.¹ But it is only in the Life of St. Dorothea, as quoted at the beginning of this article, and in the prohibitions of German synods of the fifteenth century, that the practice of continuous exposition has so far come under my notice. It is impossible not to conjecture that the institution of *Sacraments-häusen*, the elaborate and often extremely beautiful stone tabernacles, erected apart from the altar in places accessible to the people, has some connection with this custom. Doors of strong metal trellis-work, of which many of them show traces, would easily give security to the transparent monstrance within, while they allowed this precious treasure of the Body of Christ to be freely gazed upon by the devout. It is in any case certain that the repeated enactments of episcopal synods did not entirely put an end to this custom. The Catholic controversialist, J. Gropper, whose book was printed at Cologne in 1560, complains loudly of the abuses still prevalent in Germany in his day with regard to the Blessed Sacrament.

"Besides the daily Elevation in the Mass," he protests, "the Blessed Sacrament is exposed to men's gaze a great deal too much, and, indeed, is generally left quite open to view," and further on he speaks of that "unusual, continuous, and almost daily Exposition, as they call it, of the Blessed Sacrament in transparent monstrances."²

Although not completely successful, the ordinances of the synods, no doubt, kept in check to a great extent this singular form of devotion to the Holy Eucharist, which threatened to develop into an abuse. At the same time, the eager wish to salute the Blessed Sacrament unveiled seems by the end of the fifteenth century to have spread to other lands besides Germany. Here however it was better controlled, and limited to suitable times and places, corresponding more nearly to the rules which govern our Expositions at the present day. We must turn then to consider in our next article those special elements which give to the service its present name of *Salut* or *Benediction*.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

¹ *Mobilier Français*, i. p. 246. It is in two stories, possibly the lower was intended for the Holy Oils. That this should have been left to stand on the altar, seems quite possible, to judge by an account of a pyx with the Blessed Sacrament venerated in a public church by St. Ida, of Louvain. (*AA. SS.* vol. ii. p. 172.)

² J. Gropper, *De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia*. Colonice, 1560, pp. 515, 516.

One Woman's Work.

CHAPTER V.

MAGDALEN'S four sisters had made their First Communion as soon as convenient after their twelfth birthday, this being in accordance with a rule laid down not by their Catholic father, but by their Protestant mother. In many ways the latter had a real desire to do her duty by her children from the point of view of their religion. Knowing that a Catholic child's First Communion is a great epoch in its life, and having by careful inquiry found out that twelve is a very usual age at which to make it, she had laid down the above rule, with which hitherto she had allowed nothing to interfere. As soon as they reached the requisite age, they had been sent off one by one to what—so she was informed—was a suitable convent, and there, after a course of preparation, which was of course left to the nuns, they made their First Communion and returned home. The whole thing, as far as the girls were concerned, was entirely taken out of their father's hands. In the case of Swithin he was allowed to do as he chose, and he and his confidant, Father Vandermeulen, had arranged it between them.

Magdalen remained. She had struck twelve in the spring before Joan came from Italy; but Mrs. Venn, judging by her appearance more than by any knowledge of her mental or spiritual development, had pronounced her to be too young, and decreed that her First Communion was to be deferred for a year. Mr. Venn, who had at that time reached a climax of depression which surely presaged relief, meekly acquiesced, and of course Magdalen was satisfied if he was.

Joan knew of the arrangement, so that she was surprised when one day, towards the close of the year, her uncle with nervous and hesitating manner asked her whether she would help him to prepare his little Magdalen for her First Com-

munion. The child herself had become anxious to make it, but with blind confidence in her uninitiating father she felt no desire to broach the subject to him until he thought fit to make the suggestion. To make a suggestion was not his bent either by art or by nature; and had he not called Joan from her convent home, father and child would have gone on waiting indefinitely till Mrs. Venn chose to speak. But he actually did take the initiative; and it was a sign of her uncle's expansion of nature, far greater than Joan who had known him only recently could possibly appreciate, which made him one day ask his little daughter very shyly if she would like to make her First Communion, and which, moreover, made him undertake her preparation himself with only Joan's co-operation. Joan herself rejoiced in the opportunity given her of being of use to her little cousin whose loyal love had won her heart, and of helping the neglected, faithful little creature to put straightness for crookedness and right for wrong.

Those were really happy days which followed, hallowed by the intimacy and love of the three friends. Joan thought the arrangement as natural as it was delightful, and never realized what a stupendous act of mutiny her uncle was committing. All the same it was blessed, and his niece soon saw that he was capable of doing what he had undertaken thoroughly well, though somewhat eccentrically. She herself had but little to do for Magdalen, all her work consisting in supplementing and adapting the instruction given by the child's father.

Expanding more and more under the influence of sympathy and the consciousness of being of use to the little joy of his heart, Mr. Venn brought to light hidden fountains of wisdom—a very storehouse of treasure which he himself was ignorant of possessing, though he had been accumulating it during his years of solitude and prayer. He was quite as much amazed as either of his hearers at what a lot he had to say, and at how well he said it. As for the child, she listened with large eyes and parted lips, and drank in all he said, though very much was beyond her comprehension. Had his words contained the rankest heresy she would have imbibed it reverently and unquestioningly, coming from such a source; and well was it, therefore, for his little daughter that he had been for years a faithful, silent listener to the voice of the Holy Ghost. As for himself, in spite of his diffident humility, he knew, and rejoiced to know, that he was helping the little being he loved best on

earth, and that it was for no vain purpose that he had been given to her as her father. As Joan watched his quietly grateful happiness, she could scarcely regret the chill life outside which had driven her to break through the barrier of her uncle's reserve, and make her way into his confidence.

There was something very lovely about this peace and joy which reigned behind the green baize door, but nevertheless Joan's heart misgave her. It could not be right, she felt, that one portion of a family should be so entirely severed in its higher life from the rest; and in spite of the happiness it brought her, she felt at times sorry that she had been drawn in to making one of the very exclusive trio. Worse was to follow; and poor little Magdalen's spiritual interests were to be the cause of one of the most violent domestic storms which ever raged at Brookethorpe.

When Mr. Venn, contemplating his work, felt that he had done all he could for his child, and that the completion must be left to God alone, he knew that the moment had arrived when he must talk to her mother. So, with chill finger-tips and throbbing pulses, he told his wife what he had been doing during the last few weeks, and ended by saying he wished his little Magdalen to make her First Communion at home with him. His instincts had told him that Mrs. Venn was sure to make some opposition to anything which he so evidently desired; but he was surprised to find how very indignant the suggestion made her. She did not love Magdalen as some mothers love their children, but she was none the less tenacious of her maternal rights, and—perhaps unacknowledged to herself—keenly jealous of her husband's great devotion to this child.

"Indeed, Augustine," she said in her most imposing and, to him, crushing manner, "it would be exceedingly improper for Magdalen to receive her First Communion at home in such an informal, unprepared manner. She might as well be a village child. I am not going to let it be said that I forget I am the child's mother, though I am not a Roman Catholic; and I intend that she shall have the same advantages that her sisters had. I cannot attend to it now, but it is my wish that after Christmas she should go to the same convent where the others went, and before the New Year I will write to the Lady Superior, and arrange about it. So you need trouble yourself no further."

Mr. Venn's veins throbbed nearly to bursting, but he said

nothing. In a moment his wife's trenchant, imposing manner shrivelled up the life and energy which had been slowly generating in his heart. He knew that he dared not brave her openly; nevertheless, he left the room firmly resolved that the joy of his heart should not be parted from him for this the greatest event in her young life. He had his way, though to accomplish it he exercised a great deal of rather untrue, unmanly ingenuity, such as is forced on those who are ground down under a tyrant's heel.

When, some weeks after, Mrs. Venn, true to her word, returned, as she thought generously, to the subject and asked her husband whether, as she was going to write to the Lady Superior about Magdalen, he had any wishes on the subject, or suggestions to make, he, turning first cold then hot, stammered out the startling intelligence that the child had already made her First Communion. Mrs. Venn's indignation was fiercely and bitterly expressed, and a new barrier was built up between her and her husband; but there was one in the house who felt it more, and with whom it took longer to get over it. Freda was slow to understand why neither her father nor little sister—to whom she had never been otherwise than kind—should have felt no imperative wish to take her into their confidence on such a great subject. She had too little self-love to feel sore and wounded, but she was very unhappy that such a thing could have, and had, happened. When it slowly dawned upon her that it was but the natural result of the way she had separated herself from those two—who really were to be considered as one—in all their more sacred interests, and had taken for granted that there must be two camps in the house, and when this lesson made its way home, Freda had probably reached a turning-point in her life. As to Maud and Bertha, in their different ways they met in the common conclusion that their mother had been very badly treated. Magdalen was the last person to be thought of in the matter.

In the main they were right, for it was an unlovely family episode. The fact was that poor Mr. Venn in acting as he did had yielded to sheer panic. He knew perfectly well that he was incapable of coping openly with his masterful wife, and had followed a secretive impulse such as actuates a hunted animal, bent on hiding its offspring from the destroyer. Following the same instinct he would gladly have taken no one into his

confidence, and it was only by force of necessity that he revealed his secret intention to old Father Duvivier and Joan, whom it was impossible to leave in the dark. Both did their utmost, separately and in concert, to persuade him to give up his plan, which, as they vainly pointed out, would be fraught with all sorts of evils to every one, and especially to Magdalen. But with the invincible obstinacy of a weak man he doggedly combated their remonstrances against the clandestinity of the affair; and at last they agreed that rather than alienate him altogether, and probably drive him to carry out his plan in some still more underhand manner, they had better help him, and try to palliate the evil by their co-operation.

As for Magdalen, her own natural reserve and secretiveness, added to her unbounded confidence in her father's wisdom, removed all desire to utter a word about the great subject to any one outside her narrow little circle. She disliked her governess, and detested her mother's maid who looked after her; and she so seldom saw her sisters, except at meal-time, that there was but little temptation to be indiscreet; and as for her mother, an inborn instinct kept her silent towards her on every matter connected with religion. Swithin she would have told had he been at home, and she did write a long letter to him in her large, straggling, ill-taught hand, the answer to which arrived when the great event was a thing of the past. It never occurred to her that her sister Freda, who was a virtual stranger and generally occupied about things in which the child had no concern, would, had she confided in her, have opened her large heart, and given her all the love and sympathy that a sister could.

So the day fixed on arrived, and one frosty morning, a week before Christmas, the three true friends wended their way to the village church, quite certain that no one else from the house would be there. And surely God's great gift was not received in vain by the quaint, faithful, and strangely brought up child. For what else could it have been that made her, after their return home, throw her arms round her father's neck with unwonted expansiveness and whisper in his ear the two words: "Poor mama!" Surely the crooked ways were beginning to be made straight.

It was not to be wondered at that Mrs. Venn was deeply and seriously wounded by the secrecy of the whole affair; for despots never can realize to what straits of duplicity they

often drive their victims. She felt too truly wounded to vent her feelings in wrath, but, shrugging her shoulders, told her husband that it required only her own experience to teach her the truth of what she had always been told of the jesuitical and disingenuous ways inculcated by the Roman Church.

But if this was all she said to her husband, and if a studious and chill severity of manner was the only sign of her displeasure towards Magdalen—who, poor little girl, felt for the first time in her life a wish to show love towards her mother and receive some expression of it in return—it was towards Joan that she felt most bitterness. It was perhaps natural for her to believe, in spite of the protestations which the girl felt bound for justice sake to make, that it was to her treachery and dishonesty that the whole deception was owing. She sent for her niece, as she had done the day after Baldur's dismissal, and her words filled Joan with self-reproach, not for her conduct on this particular occasion, but for being in the house at all to be a cause of discord and dissension. For her aunt's manner was neither angry nor insulting as it had been on the previous occasion, and her reproaches—ill-founded though they were—had a ring of sincerity and pathos which went to the girl's heart.

"Unless," she finished by saying, "unless after all these years of experience of a Catholic husband and children who, whatever their faults, have always been honest and truthful to me, unless I had lived to know what I now know, no one could have made me believe the things that have been told me by credible witnesses of the underhand, disingenuous ways of proceeding which are bred and taught by your religion. It was my pride to turn a deaf ear to all such insinuations. But the absolute distortion of your conscience makes me fear for my children, when I am no longer with them to protect them from exposure to the influences of a system which, according to my Protestant and English notions, calls wrong right, and lies truth. After what has happened now, even you cannot deny that you are a sower of discord in my home."

"Yes, Aunt Ella," said Joan, "I must and do deny it."

"Who then," proceeded Mrs. Venn, still calmly, "who then has after all our years of married life, set my husband against me, so that to follow his own will against my advice, he has lied barefacedly to me? And who has set all my children—my guileless little child, my son, and even my true and faithful Freda, against my desires, but you? You have—and I must

say it—been to me as a snake in the grass, and would to God it were in my power to rid my home of you, for I live in fear lest those of my children who still trust in me will turn against me.”

“I think you are unjust, Aunt Ella,” said Joan, gently, for her heart felt strangely softened towards her aunt, and her conscience was not free from compunction. “I never could have acted as you think, or set your children against you.”

“It is no use arguing the question,” replied Mrs. Venn, with an air of weariness which had something theatrical in it. “We start from totally different points. Now go, for I had rather be alone.”

Joan left her, feeling, if truth be told, very unhappy. The position she was in was, she said, intolerable both to herself and every one else, and she could not take a step without harming some one. Her aunt was quite right to resent her presence; and leave Brookethorpe she must and would. So she went to her uncle, and claimed her release from her promise to stay, pleading in a passionate way that almost quenched what sparks of life remained in him. The poor man, upset by his words with his wife, which had fallen like a damp snow-storm on his recent genial and thawed condition, was in a most visibly distressed state of mind, and in response to her urgent appeal for leave to go away, implored her really, hysterically, not to leave him. Once more she yielded, sorely against her will, and things went on as before.

Be it confessed, Joan now found life very nearly intolerable. The estrangement from the rest of the family was intensified, and she shrank, more than she dared own to them, from her former footing with Mr. Venn and his little companion; and as day succeeded day in this uncongenial atmosphere, her whole heart centred itself in a longing for the home-coming of Swithin. He had had no other holiday since the month when Baldur was at home, but, at last, after several disappointments, he wrote that he would without fail, he hoped, be with his family by the end of January. Joan's longing to open her heart to her loyal friend and cousin, on intercourse with whom no restriction could be put, and with whom she could do no mischief, became so insatiable as to astound her. Poor girl, it was the hunger of a starving man when bread is held up before him; and had she reasoned on it, she might have felt sure that such absorbing anticipation could only lead to disappointment.

Only two days before Swithin was expected, he wrote a hurried letter to his father saying that his firm had suddenly decided to send him to their house at Glasgow, whither he was starting by the night mail, not to return, he thought, till the following summer at earliest. His letter was full of regrets at being done out of a holiday at Brookethorpe, but, he added, he was looking forward awfully to a new place and a new kind of job.

This disappointment was the culminating-point to Joan's dispiritedness. In fact the blow hit her so hard that it nerved her to face her life with renewed courage. It dawned upon her now as it had not dawned on her before, that she was meant to live this portion of her life without human comfort—and having faced this fact, the greatest bitterness was past.

While she was learning this lesson the worst of her troubles were actually over, for the home atmosphere lost some of its frigidity. Domestic events occurred which absorbed the attention of the family to such an extent that Joan's rejection of Baldur, her consequent ostracism, and the affair of Magdalen's First Communion were relegated to the background, and her relationship with her cousins became, perforce, more natural.

CHAPTER VI.

THE family event which created such a diversion in Joan's favour was that Maud at last secured a husband, who, strange as it may seem when more is told, satisfied her requirements, and—more strange still—those, ostensibly, of her mother also. He could not, however, have been such a husband as it had once entered the heart of Mrs. Venn to dream of for her beautiful Maud.

In olden days, before her marriage with Augustine Venn, Eleanor Biddulph had known, talked to, and danced with a young man named Horatio Karsdale. He was one of the number who dared to aspire to the hand of the heiress, though he never committed himself to a proposal. Being of a cautious disposition, he came to the timely conclusion that such a step would be met by a refusal humiliating to his vanity, and he wisely acted on it. Therefore she did not know for a certainty that he had ever regarded her as anything but a friend, and, as such, she bestowed her favour on him. But

their acquaintance was of short duration, for having made this one very futile attempt to settle down in life, he indulged in more erratic views, which led him to despise English society and English girls, and settle down to a bachelor life in Paris. What with his almost total disappearance from the London world and her own marriage, Mrs. Venn, if truth be told, nearly forgot the fact of his existence.

It was only during the last season, after Joan's arrival at her uncle's house, that Horatio Karsdale returned to the scene of his earlier life, and, having reintroduced himself to Mrs. Venn, became a frequent visitor at Eaton Place. She knew very well that he was, to say the least of it, her own contemporary; and thus he was the only male creature who showed a desire to be her constant guest whom she did not regard as even a possible husband for any of her daughters. She would, undoubtedly, have taken greater precautions could she have seen him as he saw himself; for in his own estimation he was still a gay young bachelor, in no way—except by the unfortunate and stubborn accident of age—the contemporary of this lady with a grown-up family. A very superficial observer might have taken the same view as himself, but a closer examination would have brought with it a speedy disillusionment. However glossy brown were Mr. Karsdale's perfumed locks, there was a suspicious difference between the colour of his hair near the roots and that of its curly tips. His complexion was fresh, but to some its rosininess savoured of the rouge-pot; and, in spite of the uprightness of his figure, there was about it a certain stiffness, accompanied by ominous and audible creakings which to the captious told a tale of stays. In fact, far from belonging to a younger generation than Mrs. Venn, he was practically a much older person than she; and deprived of all rejuvenating appliances would have looked considerably more than his real age; for though since their parting Mrs. Venn and he had lived the same number of years, he had lived his portion harder and faster.

Thanks to the perfume of early association and his own pleasant, well-trained conversational powers, Mr. Karsdale soon ingratiated himself with Mrs. Venn; for however much she might regard it as mere waste of time to bestow pains on the society of a man about whom she could hatch no matrimonial plots, she was alive to the fact of his being a valuable addition to her dinner and other parties. She might be blind to see that

he devoted more of his time to her daughters than he did to herself, but their perceptions on the subject were very keen; and it soon became a wearisome habit with Maud and Bertha to tease Freda about what they called her ancient admirer. Not one of the three dreamed of his being audacious enough to aspire to the hand of Maud. Their mistake was excusable, for at first he divided his attentions very equally between Mrs. Venn's two elder daughters, hovering in his choice between Maud's beauty and Freda's greater powers of conversation. He had no wish to be precipitate in his selection.

The sole and—to himself—avowed object of his visit to London was the choice of a suitable wife. Having, during his sojourn in France, combined a good deal of shrewd and successful speculation with pleasure, he had amassed a considerable fortune in hard cash, and, having satiated himself with the enjoyment and indulgences of life, was anxious to settle down, as he called it, for the remainder of his days. Settling down involved as a matter of course the taking to himself of a desirable wife to share his fortune, and give him heirs to his wealth; and the younger and prettier this wife, the better she would suit his views.

As soon as he had quite formulated these plans for his future, Mr. Karsdale shut up his flat in Paris, and came on his voyage of exploration to London; for it was a *sine qua non* that his wife should be English. His thoughts recurred almost at once to Mrs. Venn and her family, for he had not forgotten her existence as much as she had forgotten his. She represented English life to him, and he had often made inquiries about her from mutual friends, and had thus kept pace, more or less, with her life. When he had wished to marry her, he had undoubtedly been more in love with her money than herself, but all throughout he had held her in respect, and, whether as maiden or matron, she had always been to him the ideal of what an Englishwoman should be. She was in the world and of the world, as he felt it was but right that a woman of her wealth should be, but no most ill-natured gossip had ever been able to cast a slur on her reputation either as single or married. That she should have so conducted herself in spite of all the temptations incident on position and wealth, and in spite, more than all, of being linked to a husband who, according to common report, was but little better than an imbecile, filled the worldly wise old *roué* with an admiration to which he could

scarcely put words. Whenever he had contemplated the idea of honouring any woman with his hand and name, it had been a foregone conclusion that she must be above any suspicion or breath of slander. Where, now that the decisive moment of choice was approaching, where could he turn with better chance of success than to one of the daughters of Mrs. Venn?

When the time came for the family to leave London, Mr. Karsdale also took his departure from England. Mrs. Venn invited him to Brookethorpe, but with professed regret he declined on the plea that it was his invariable custom to go in the summer to some German waters. The fact was that, having taken his preliminary matrimonial survey to his satisfaction, he required time for reflection before he made up his mind to the great leap, or could decide which of his friend's daughters were more worthy of the great honour contemplated for her.

He spoke the truth when he said he was going to some German waters, but he omitted to add that he intended to combine health with pleasure, and also visit a German gambling-place. He took his leave of London with ill-concealed hilarity, feeling very much like a schoolboy starting home for the holidays. He had been on his good behaviour quite long enough to suit his taste, and craved for one last spell of bachelor life, before he renounced it for evermore. Horatio Karsdale was very far from being a villain, and once he did make up his mind to marry, he meant to be an irreproachable husband.

Absence soon cleared his brain; and in spite of his temporary return to old habits, he felt no doubt whatever that he really meant matrimony; and he went so far as to write to his lawyers to complete the purchase of a nice little property in Essex, a matter which he had allowed to remain open pending the decision of his calling in life. With absence, moreover, all doubt as to the object of his choice disappeared, and he thought no more about Freda. He quite forgot all the embarrassing difficulties he had experienced when trying to carry on a conversation with Maud. He only remembered her beauty, and decided for good and all in her favour. Such an impression had the pretty young girl made on him, that, in spite of the attractions of his return to a bachelor life, he found his time in Germany hang heavy on his hands, and it was with real pleasure that he returned to England, and, late in the year, wrote to Mrs. Venn to propose himself to Brookethorpe.

He signed the final documents concerning the purchase of his property, and then entered the train, full of a feeling of self-congratulation and semi-heroism; for he meant to make the plunge, and begin at once to pay his addresses to this young girl, nearly forty years his junior, and resplendent, if not with intellect, at least with youth, innocence, and beauty. Unfortunately for the moral of the story, he met with a success which he did not deserve.

He had resolved to conduct the whole affair according to certain social laws which he had learned somewhere or other, perhaps from old-fashioned novels, but more probably from his friends in France. Thus for some weeks he lingered on at Brookethorpe, and invariably asked permission to return when business called him away for a day or two. During these weeks, Maud really succeeded in winning as much of his heart as there was left to win. As she became sufficiently intimate with him to take his presence as a matter of course, she found her tongue, and could prattle quite freely about the daily little nothingnesses of her life. It had been different during their acquaintance in London, where she had felt ill-at-ease, and thought herself called on to talk, if not about politics, at any rate about people. There was not much sense in what she said, but there was a great deal of simplicity, which Mr. Karsdale, having no very exalted opinion of respectable women's intellects, preferred of the two.

After his preliminary visits, Mr. Karsdale in approved old-fashioned style asked Mrs. Venn's permission to pay his addresses to her daughter. It never occurred to him to ask the same permission of the girl's father, about whose mental condition he entertained the most false and exaggerated opinions, and whom—if truth be told—he never considered at all except as a warrant for Maud's unexceptionable respectability.

To do Mrs. Venn justice, her first feeling with Karsdale was one of unmixed indignation. Up to the very moment he spoke to her, she had never contemplated him as even a possible husband for either of her daughters; and she reproached him in no measured language for what report told her about his manner of life in Paris during the long years that had elapsed since their own early friendship. Horatio Karsdale was too much a man of the world himself, and had too much admiration for Mrs. Venn as a woman of the world, to care

to dissemble, and denied nothing that she cared to bring up against him. He only pleaded his present state and purpose, declaring with a solemnity which finally carried conviction to Maud's mother, that were he fortunate enough to win her daughter as his wife, he would have no object in life save her happiness, and that no husband's devotion should equal his.

Though convinced on this point, Mrs. Venn was not pleased, nor did she take any pains to conceal her displeasure. Her maternal pride resented the thought of giving her child—the choicest of her family—to this old profligate. But as he continued his skilful pleading, a less worthy feeling took the place of her first indignation. She recalled her anxieties about her girls' matrimonial prospects, and how she had even lain awake at night in dread of the next season, when Bertha would be out, picturing to herself the difficulties of taking out three daughters, each one jostling the others, and doing injury to their chances. The disappointment of Maud's matrimonial failure was still rankling in her mind and wounding her pride, and, recalling that bitter experience, she began to regard Karsdale with a more favourable eye. He was neither young nor faultless, but he was possessed of both power and will to make her daughter a wealthy and happy woman. She was persuaded that he would be a devoted husband, and what more, she asked herself, could she wish? Still, as she owed to herself without compunction, she wished that he had chosen Freda instead of Maud. Thus Mrs. Venn's consent was obtained to his paying his addresses to Maud, and with this Karsdale had to be content, though it was given with a want of cordiality which hurt his vanity not a little.

Having obtained her mother's consent, and taken her father's for granted, the ancient suitor set to work in a most deliberate manner, and after the most approved fashion, to pay his court to Maud. So artfully and successfully did he act, that he contrived to win her favour completely before it occurred to her or to any one but her mother that he had matrimony in view. It was only towards the end of January, after the episode of Magdalen's First Communion, that the family became aware of his intentions.

Poor Mr. Venn was the last to know anything, and before it even dawned on him that his daughter was being disposed of under his very eyes, his wife announced triumphantly to him that Mr. Karsdale had proposed to Maud, and had been

accepted! Trembling and nervous, he felt once more that he was too late, and that, for aught he knew, Maud might be inveigled into making a marriage under similar conditions to that of her sister Edith. With characteristic helplessness he accepted, with semi-despair, the conclusion that he was too late, and was totally incapable of rousing himself to take energetic measures, and stay the marriage by imposing conditions if he could, or by refusing his sanction if he could not. This moral paralysis was in reality almost as much beyond his control as would have been paralysis of the limbs.

Had it not been for Joan, probably he would have continued inert and inactive until it was really too late. It was not much she could do directly to avert the catastrophe, but it was not likely that she would remain passive without doing her best to hold out a helping hand to save her silly young cousin from poor Edith's fate. But she, owing to her false and isolated position in the house, had been kept in the dark as to the true state of affairs longer even than Mr. Venn.

When she went, as was her wont, to say good morning to her uncle after her return from Mass, she found him on his knees with his face buried in his hands; and then he told her what had happened. Late the preceding night his wife had cast the news of Maud's engagement like a thunderbolt at him, and he had remained prostrate and miserable ever since, praying indeed for help and consolation in his distress, but with heart so down-stricken and craven that he could not even try to hope, or stretch forth his hands to receive the help he asked for. Joan comforted him tenderly, and tried to persuade him that the evil was not irremediable. Never had she felt more thankful than at this moment that she had not deserted her mother's poor brother. Her very touch and voice brought courage to him. He lost his nervous fears when there was any one to take his hand and stand by him; for it was the solitude of his futile struggles for principle which sometimes threatened to turn his brain.

After breakfast the announcement of the great event was made to Joan by Freda in the presence of the blissful looking Maud, on whose finger blazed a splendid diamond ring, placed there the evening before by her ancient suitor. As the ladies of the family were slowly wending their way from the drawing-room the night before, Mr. Karsdale had, on some pretext or other, induced Maud to linger behind her mother and sisters,

and had contrived to put into words his long meditated request, and had elicited the affirmative answer which, as he there and then declared, made him the happiest man in the world. Stooping down he took her hand and, while he tenderly kissed her finger tips, he managed to place on one of them the ring which she now so proudly wore.

All this and much beside was told to Joan by her cousins, excitement breaking down all barriers between them. She tried to be as sympathetic as she could, but the effort was painful, for the whole courtship, with its travesty of love, was very repulsive to her. Freda's tongue moved so eloquently that it was some time before she could get in a word.

"Oh, dear Maud, I do hope and trust you will be happy," she said at last. "But I must—Freda, you must tell me—on what conditions has Maud accepted Mr. Karsdale? He remembers she is a Catholic, does he not? Have she and your mother put everything before him as it should be—about religion, I mean, Maud?"

"I don't know, I think he understands," replied Maud, absently, worshipping the ring on her finger. "Horatio knows, of course, that I am a Catholic, and spoke to me beautifully about it last night when he asked me to be his wife. Oh, Freda, just look at the colours in the middle stone. Did you ever see anything so lovely! Do just look at them from here."

"I've been bothering my head about the same thing, Joan," said Freda, without stirring from her place to look at the sparkling gem. "I have been thinking about it ever since Maud came to me last night and told me she had accepted him. Of course, Maud," she went on, turning to her sister, "he knows you are a Catholic; but do you think he knows exactly all it means, and what he ought to agree to before you marry him?"

"He is so clever. He knows everything," replied Maud, with a look of soft reproach in her gazelle-like eyes.

"But he may not have thought of this," her sister ventured to suggest.

"He is noble," said Maud, quite enthusiastically. "Even if he promises nothing in words, I know he will do all that is right."

"But he must promise in words, must he not, Joan?" came from Freda.

"Oh don't, please don't," pleaded Maud, large tears starting into her eyes. "He might not like it. It might look like

mistrusting him. We had better leave it as it is for the present—please do. I should be so afraid of annoying him. He is—he is—oh so noble,” she repeated, finding the word suitable to convey all the qualities with which she chose to clothe her ancient lover.

“Don’t be silly,” began her sister; but Maud interrupted her.

“You see,” she pleaded, “I am so much younger than he is. He must know best, and I could not lay down the law to him; it would look so presumptuous. And indeed, Freda, indeed, Joan, you may trust him and trust me too.”

“You are too provoking,” retorted her sister, tartly, for she felt her impotence. Joan meanwhile searched her brain for the best steps to be taken.

“But, Freda,” continued Maud, in pathetic tones; “you know what he is. I am so afraid of offending him. If I seem not to trust him he may be annoyed with me, and go away and leave me altogether—and I should never, never be happy again, and never, never forgive you.”

“But Maud, dear Maud, do listen,” persisted Freda, affectionately, frightened by the sight of the corners of her pretty sister’s mouth turning downward, and her features puckering themselves preparatory to an outburst of tears.

What would have happened next can only be surmised, for the conversation was interrupted. Bertha, watchful Bertha, had in the interval entered the room, and without difficulty grasped the subject of the conversation and the cause of her sister’s agitation. She was not one at all likely to earn the historical flitch of bacon by leaving other people’s concerns alone, and was, moreover, too anxious to keep the proud position of her mother’s confidante not to interfere on an occasion like this.

“Freda—Joan,” she burst in sharply, “you know that this is exactly the sort of conversation that mama has forbidden us to have altogether. If you don’t stop I shall go and tell her.”

“Do go, you little eavesdropper—little sneak, little tell-tale,” cried Freda, her face on fire, returning in the heat of her wrath and worry to the use of long-forgotten school-room language. “Joan, quick—help me. What shall we do?”

“Do?” replied Joan, fixing Bertha with indignant eyes. “Why, go to your father and tell him about it.”

“How dare you, you sly, underhand creature, as mama calls

you," cried Bertha. "Well, I shall anyhow go and tell her all that you are plotting;" and so saying, she left the room.

Whether she fulfilled her threat or not cannot be said; but certain it is that two minutes later Mrs. Venn entered the room rather hurriedly. She found it, however, empty, save for Maud, who sat on the window-sill, worshipping her ring in the sun's rays. All discomfiture had vanished from her countenance, for all remembrance of her late disagreeable encounter with her sister had faded from her happy memory.

Mr. Venn's life, though depressed, was neither as hopeless nor joyless as it had been six months before; so when Freda invaded his room rather impetuously and, without hesitation or preamble, consulted him about Maud's engagement, he did not feel the same exquisite pleasure as when he discovered that Swithin had Christian views of life. Nor was his surprise at his present discovery equal to then, for it is the way of the world to take it for granted that religion comes naturally to girls though not to boys. However, if his surprise was not equal to what it had been on the former occasion, it was quite enough to make him question himself in a bewildered manner, and ask whether he had been all along labouring under a mistake in thinking that all his children were antagonistic to him in the matter of religion.

Freda was so possessed by the single-hearted desire to help her silly sister against herself, that she forgot to feel nervous, as she might otherwise have felt, at the idea of such an unusual interview with her father. She sat down beside him and spoke out in a downright, honest way, which was like balm to poor Mr. Venn's anxious, vacillating, hesitating nature.

"Now, papa, what can we do?" his daughter said at last, when she had faithfully repeated Maud's account of her engagement, and told him of her own and Joan's anxiety on the subject. "Something must be done at once, must it not? You know we shall never forgive ourselves if we let Maud's marriage be like Edith's over again."

"Never, never," said her father, moaning, but resolutely. The knowledge that Freda thus deplored her elder sister's experiences gave him a strength of purpose in which he had felt entirely lacking five minutes before. "What do you suggest, Freda? Can I do anything?"

"Well, papa, there is no doubt that some one must talk to Mr. Karsdale this very morning. Will you; or shall I, from you?"

"You would do it much better," replied her father, with no hesitation.

"I believe it would be best," said she; for, if truth be told, she had an unnecessary want of faith in her father's resolution or powers of diplomacy. "Then, when I have put everything clearly before him, you must step in and put your foot down, and say you will not let him marry Maud unless he promises to do all he has got to do."

"Very well, my dear child, I will do that; but do you make it very plain to him, and then he must see that I have a right to speak. He does not seem to take me into account somehow, does he, my dear?" As he spoke he rubbed his hands softly together, and such a merry smile twinkled in his blue eyes that Freda felt as if she had never till now made her father's acquaintance, though that twinkle was often there for those who cared to see it; and spoke volumes both to Magdalen and Joan. "Do you know," he went on confidentially, "I have had scarcely five minutes' talk with him since he has been in the house, and it never occurred to me that he was thinking of Maud, for he is more than old enough to be her father. He was your mother's friend when he was young, and I was stupid enough to think that he was hanging about here only on account of his affection for old days. I am so startled at finding out that he wants to marry Maud, and that she and your mother have accepted him without asking my opinion, that I feel in quite a false position. Before you came and cheered me up I felt very unhappy, for I feared that by my folly I had let matters go too far to stop the mischief. Thank God, my dear child, that it is not too late."

"Poor papa," said Freda, with honest commiseration. As she spoke it occurred to her how much more natural her life in the past would have been had she been on terms of intimacy with her father, and able to go in and out of his room to talk freely about the events and surmises of life. Her intelligence may not have been of a very high order, nor her perceptions very quick, nevertheless a good many new ideas had been penetrating her mind during the last few months. As it dawned for the first time on this unselfish girl how little she had contributed to the happiness of her father's life, many resolutions for the future formed themselves in her soul; and solid Freda was one who rarely made resolutions in vain.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

A Recent Convent Case.

Upon my tongues continual slanders ride,
Which I in every language do pronounce,
Stuffing the ears of men with false reports.

FROM this speech, which he puts into the mouth of "Rumour," it appears by no means certain that in an engine for the dissemination of reports from every quarter of the earth, like the modern press, Shakespeare would have recognized the purely beneficent agent which it is so generally assumed to be. Certainly, amongst the difficulties against which we Catholics have continually to struggle, not the least is the continual importation from abroad through our newspapers of fresh material to swell the anti-Catholic tradition; which sort of thing appears to be no less diligently purveyed for the English market than other products of every clime. It thus comes about that wherever on the face of earth anything occurs which can be cited or made to appear as an instance of the bigotry or tyranny or covetousness of the Church and her representatives, the ears of our countrymen are presently stuffed with accounts of it, in which positiveness of statement usually does duty for accuracy as to facts. What makes matters worse is that, as the Roman poet has it, who seems to agree with our own in having but a poor opinion of Rumour, it speedily assumes such dimensions that its head is hidden in the clouds, so that it becomes impossible to check or confute it by examination of details which nobody remembers, no more remaining in the public mind than a very vague but quite positive conviction that the Catholic Church has once more been convicted of something very awful.

A few weeks ago, for example, our newspapers were all agog about a supposed outrage in Spain, where it was alleged that a young lady of means had been kidnapped by the Jesuits and immured in a convent, of course for the sake of

her money, and that the proceeding was so outrageous as to have aroused the indignation of the entire population, making them clamour for the expulsion of the prime authors of the mischief. To obtain trustworthy information as to the details of a somewhat complicated story has required time, and now that we are in a position to put the facts before our readers, it is to be feared that the horrible tale has become too nebulous to be effectively exposed. We must trust that the slight sketch given above will make the significance of the following particulars sufficiently intelligible.

The young lady in question, by name Ubao, had lost her father, from whom she was to inherit her share of the family estate, the amount being still undetermined. She had no other expectations. Two years previously she had gone to confession to a Jesuit Father, to whom she never mentioned her idea of becoming a nun, which she did not at that period entertain. Since that time she had no communication with him or any other Jesuit, her confessor being a certain Don Francisco, Rector of the "Carboneras," who was the confessor of other members of the family. When with his approval she determined to enter the Convent of the Servants of the Sacred Heart, she had completed her twenty-third year, and was thus of age according to the Spanish law. Her mother absolutely refusing her consent to the proposed step, the daughter, after giving notice that she would act for herself, proceeded to do so. When she presented herself at the convent, the Superior at once sent to inform the mother, and various members of the family speedily attended, vehemently urging her to abandon her intention. She, on the other hand, insisting on her legal right to choose her own course, demanded that a magistrate should be brought before whom she might make a statutory declaration, to which, however, her relatives would not agree; but at a later period the Superior insisted on its being done. She also recommended the postulant under the circumstances to yield, until she could obtain the consent of her family; but the suggestion being peremptorily refused, she did not feel justified in further interference. So, too, the Bishop, to whom the relatives appealed, having looked into the matter, declared that he had no right to interfere with one who had a perfect right to choose her own state of life. Meanwhile, the convent authorities would not allow the young lady to contribute to their funds anything beyond the dower required in the case of

all who enter, it being apparent that the money question was at the bottom of the whole difficulty. It was therefore insisted that if Mdle. Ubao should insist on devoting her fortune to pious purposes, these should be altogether independent of the body which she had joined.

The relatives next applied to the law courts for an injunction compelling her to return to her home. The case was entrusted on behalf of herself and convent to the eminent jurist, Señor Maura, who had held office in the Liberal administration of Señor Sagasta, and who pronounced without hesitation that the young lady was legally entitled to act as she proposed. This opinion having been confirmed by the decision of the Court of First Instance, and on appeal, by that of Second Instance likewise, the case was finally taken to the supreme tribunal. It was whilst this last appeal was still pending, and before any decision had been arrived at, that the popular disturbances arose. Crowds assembled before the court-house demanding a decision favourable to the appellants; otherwise they threatened to take violent measures against the Jesuits, who now for the first time appeared upon the scene. Growing impatient with delay, they proceeded to stone the carriage of the Nuncio, and hostile demonstrations were made against General Azcarraga and various members of his Ministry. The arrival at this juncture of the Count of Caserta to be present at the marriage of his son with the Princess of Asturias was made the occasion of turning these disturbances to purposes more strictly political, as a demonstration against the reigning family.

After some delay the supreme court announced its decision. In the clearest and most definite terms it found that the novice had entered of her own free-will. In spite of this, however, it decided, on purely legal grounds, that she must be compelled to return home. According to the 321st Article of the Civil Code, a woman, though of age, cannot till the completion of her twenty-fifth year leave home without parental consent, except to embrace a permanent state of life (*tomar estado*). This had hitherto been held to mean to marry, or to embrace a religious life, and the inferior courts had so understood the phrase. The supreme court now decides that *tomar estado* means to marry, and nothing else. Mdle. Ubao has consequently been compelled to leave the convent, to which she declares her resolve of returning when she shall be at liberty to do so.

The ruling of the supreme court upon the point in question has provoked much comment. It is pointed out that it is quite novel, and contradicts the authority of jurists of the highest character. But the severest thing was said of it by an ultra-Liberal journal, which jubilantly observed that the uproar outside had been instructive to the judges.

Our readers will probably remember that a similar case in Portugal, which obtained even more celebrity, was proved to possess even less foundation in fact. The young lady in this instance, who had attained the age of thirty-five, being unhappy at home, had, by the advice of lay friends, taken lodgings in a convent, as a boarder. That was all.

Subterfuges.

It is not only through the shortness of our public's memory that matters such as we are considering become too misty and vague to be properly dealt with. There is likewise an art of obscuring the true issue which is constantly practised. Although, as we all know, Englishmen are singularly distinguished by their love of fair play, the sort of fair play which, in many instances, seems to be thought good enough for Catholics, is of a very curious description, as the following recent instances will serve to show.

A newspaper calling itself the *Christian*, in its issue of May 24, made categorically two statements, (1) that, as a matter of common knowledge, a majority of Catholics in this country are Jesuits, and probably a large proportion of the Ritualistic clergy as well; (2) that all Jesuits take the ridiculous oath, the true history of which we have lately exposed, a portion of which it reproduced from a Masonic journal.

A fortnight later (June 6) it published a letter directly contradicting both statements. The writer, giving the exact number of Jesuits in the country, and adding that they all labelled themselves as such, went on to state the obvious fact that no one without ceasing to be a Jesuit or even a Catholic, could feign membership of any other religion. As to the oath, he recounted and substantiated its true history, as a production of Robert Ware and Titus Oates.

It might be supposed that, unless such a correction could be refuted, the only course was for the *Christian* to own to a mistake. Instead of this, it appended the following note, which

may be commended as a particularly fine specimen of the method of evading a difficulty by talking about something else.

We insert the contradictions as requested. As to the first statement, it could be reaffirmed most positively as applying to Jesuitical agents of the Papacy in this and other lands. As to the second, it would not be difficult to show that in phraseology and substance the "wicked and disloyal oath" is thoroughly Romish. With but little labour, its terms could be matched and its sentiments illustrated from the creeds, catechisms, decisions, bulls, and other standards of the papal system.

A similar instance is furnished by a respectable parish magazine in Essex. This had likewise been ensnared by the Jesuit Oath, which at present is bringing many simple folk to grief. On being confronted with the facts of the case, it naïvely replied that if Jesuits do not take such an oath, at least Pope Pius V. excommunicated and deposed Queen Elizabeth, which is quite as bad.

Such writers apparently regard historical investigation as a game of hunt the slipper, in which the one thing to be avoided is keeping to the point.

Dr. Horton as a Palæographer.

Dr. R. F. Horton, the prominent Nonconformist divine, is believed to owe much of the consideration with which he is regarded amongst his co-religionists to the fact that he was formerly a Fellow of New College, and enjoyed at Oxford a reputation for classical scholarship. If Dr. Horton ever deserved this reputation he certainly is not living up to it, and he has lately been engaged, together with another luminary of the Separation, Dr. Alexander Robertson, in propagating a "howler" in the matter of Greek palæography, which would have done credit to the classical attainments of, say, the late Mr. Hastings Collette.

In a volume entitled *The Gospel of St. Mark*, Dr. Robertson not long since made known to the world a remarkable discovery he had made regarding certain inscriptions in St. Mark's, Venice. The light thus afforded has evidently made an impression on Dr. Horton, for he has more than once stood godfather for the discovery, and as recently as Sunday,

June 2nd, 1901, he brought the matter to the notice of an audience at Hampstead.

"The Virgin Mary," said Dr. Horton—we quote from a full report of his address in *The Christian World Pulpit*—"appears in the Church of St. Mark in a very characteristic way. She is always a worshipper, not the object of worship, and the monogram by which she is represented—the Greek letters *MPΘY*—is so drawn in every case but one, as to show that it means, not the Mother of God, but the Mother of God's Son."

For the full explanation of this utterance however we must turn to a passage in Dr. Robertson's book, to which Dr. Horton explicitly refers in the same address. Here is the passage:

The one is a bas-relief of Mary, supposed to be of the eleventh century, and the other is of the Angel Gabriel, probably of a century earlier. Mary stands with her hands raised in the Byzantine attitude of prayer, and above her head is written *M-P ΘY*, and thus she is invariably represented—always asking blessing, never bestowing it, and her monogram was always written as it is here. That is to say, whilst the Greek *my* and *rho* are always united, the *theta* and *ypsilon* never are. Whilst, then, the first word is, of course, *μήτηρ* [*sic*] the second is not, I believe, *Θεοῦ*, and the translation is not that commonly given, "Mother of God." The *Θ*, and the *Υ*, stand for *Θεοῦ Υἱοῦ*, and, therefore, the translation is "Mother of the Divine Son." It is so read and translated in the Greek Church to this day; and the Nestorians, the disciples of St. Thomas in Chaldea, India, and China, deny to Mary the title "Mother of God," and call her the "Mother of the man Christ Jesus."¹

Now with regard to the representation of our Blessed Lady as an *Orante* ("worshipper"), it would be hard to find a more appropriate attitude for one whom Catholics of all ages have agreed in recognizing as, in a special sense, the mediatrix or intercessor with her Divine Son. Without entering here upon a discussion as to the well-attested tendency in the early centuries to treat our Blessed Lady, the *παρθένος μήτηρ*, as

¹ *The Gospel of St. Mark*, by the Rev. Alexander Robertson, D.D., pp. 47, 48. It need hardly be pointed out, that the denial of the Divine Maternity was the distinctive doctrine of the Nestorian heresy condemned at the Council of Ephesus, in 431. So far from sympathizing with Nestorianism, the vast majority of Oriental Christians are unwearied in honouring our Lady under her title *θεοτόκος*, Mother of God. Dr. Robertson's statement, that the monogram, which indeed is found on almost every *icon*, is "read and translated in the Greek Church to this day" as Mother of the Divine Son, is simply preposterous.

a type of the Church, it will be sufficient to remind Dr. Horton that Catholics, as any prayer-book would show him, habitually say: "Jesus, have mercy on us; Mary, pray for us."

But the point which now especially interests us is the interpretation of the monogram $\overline{M-P} \overline{\Theta T}$, which Dr. Robertson declares to stand for $\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \nu\iota\omicron\upsilon$, Mother of the Divine Son. Let us begin with the extrinsic evidence. Dr. Horton will no doubt have heard of a work called the *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*. It was edited, the latter portions of it especially, by some rather distinguished scholars. If Dr. Horton will examine the most recent of the four volumes of the original series he will find a section devoted to Greek Christian Inscriptions of later date. Amongst these he may discover a considerable number which contain the mystic letters so brilliantly interpreted by Dr. Robertson. We may indicate in particular Nos. 8706, 8715, 8756, 8793, 9071, 9100; of the first two, facsimiles are provided, and No. 8706 comes from the chapel of Cardinal Zeno, at St. Mark's, Venice. Strange to say the editors of the *Corpus* in every case interpret the $\overline{M-P} \overline{\Theta T}$ of the inscription as $\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, Mother of God. In every case also the connecting cross-bar (which cannot adequately be represented without special type) between the *M* and the *P* is present, while equally in every case there is no sign of a ligature between the Θ and the *T*, though the mark of contraction is always indicated above. What is more, if Dr. Horton's curiosity should lead him to examine some of the inscriptions in the volume he would find that the word $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}s$ in its various cases occurs some hundreds of times, nearly always in a contracted form, represented by its first and last letters. None the less, the "ligature" which Dr. Robertson and presumably also his disciple in archæology, Dr. Horton, take to establish the fact of contraction, is never once found in the C.I.G., any more than it is found in St. Mark's itself, where \overline{IC} stands for 'Ιησοῦς , or \overline{XC} for Χριστός , as Dr. Robertson might have learned from his own pictures.

This is not out-of-the-way information. A reference to the most obvious authorities, De Rossi, Garrucci, Kraus, and for St. Mark's, Boito; or, if Catholic writers be distrusted, to Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, s.v. "Maria," vol. ii. pp. 1152, 1158, will everywhere have the same result, and in the work last named two excellent facsimiles of pictures of the sixth century will be found, in one of which

both the contractions $\overline{M-P}$ and $\overline{\Theta-T}$ are separately enclosed in circles.

But the ligature, what of that? Let us refer again to a sufficiently common book, of which Dr. Horton, as a classical scholar, will perhaps have heard, Gardthausen's *Griechische Palæographie*. If Dr. Horton will look at the table of familiar contractions in that excellent work he will make a discovery. The contraction conventionally representing $\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$ is not after all \overline{MP} , but \overline{MHP} . (I note even in one of the inscriptions, No. 8785, of the *Corpus*, that by a curious ioticism $\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$ appears as \overline{MIP} .) Write \overline{MHP} in uncials or in the capitals of the lapidary, and, the uprights of the central H being merged in the uprights of the M and P , we get — a "ligature." It is no doubt pardonable in Dr. Horton that he should not possess an expert's knowledge in Christian archæology, but we really, really, should have expected a Fellow of New College to know that contractions in Greek manuscripts were not indicated by ligatures between the letters.

Reviews.

I.—THE PHILIPPINE ARCHIPELAGO.¹

THIS encyclopædic work, which is due to the devoted energy of the Jesuit Fathers who were gathered together in Manila from their scattered missions during the course of the recent war, and who employed the time of their freedom from their usual duties in its compilation, consists of two volumes in royal octavo containing in all 1226 pages, and 287 full-page photo-engraved plates and illustrations. Moreover, there is an accompanying atlas in folio of 30 maps, which has been adopted as one of the special publications of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The occasion of the publication of these volumes was the arrival of the members of the American Commission sent by the President of the United States to study the situation in the Philippines. At the suggestion of Admiral Dewey, the Fathers at the well-known observatory at Manila were consulted by the Commissioners. And hence the scientific data which the missionaries and the observatory staff had so laboriously collected during many years, and had put into shape and order during the troubles incident on the war, were secured by the American Government, and published in the handsome form in which the present volumes and atlas appear.

The first volume of the work consists of nine treatises, of which the Geography of the islands, so far as it is known, is the first in order. It contains a full description of the islands, that of Mindanao being more especially the work of the Jesuit missionaries, with their political divisions and administrations, industries and products. Thirty-eight half-tone plates and one chromo-lithographic plate illustrate this treatise. Then

¹ *A Collection of Geographical, Statistical, Chronological, and Scientific Data relating to the Philippine Isles, either collected from former work, or obtained by the personal observation and study of some Fathers of the Society of Jesus in the islands.* Printed at the Government Press, Washington, D.C., 1900.

follow treatises on Ethnography, and the conditions of civilization of the Philippines, containing accounts of the different races and tribes, with a discussion of their customs and languages. According to the authors of this treatise the origin of the Filipinos is to be traced to a Negrito stock who came originally from the African Continent. With these have mingled the Malays and the Mongolians from China and Japan. The treatise on the condition and culture of the people, being written with great skill and knowledge by practical experts, who have lived such devoted lives for so many years among the natives, is one of the most interesting. It discusses the questions of religion, agriculture, and industries proper to the natives, commerce, rules of public welfare, and the instruction and training most fitted to the islanders. The natives excel it appears in the technical arts, which is sufficiently apparent from the beautiful work of native draughtsmen in the atlas. Some historico-chronological data are gathered together in the following treatise, as a storehouse of facts for the future historian of the islands. They embrace the period from 1519, when Magellan first sailed to the Philippines, to the year 1899, when the Spanish army finally departed on their cession to the Americans. We can barely mention the illustrated sections on Terrestrial and Maritime Hydrography, with a description of the rivers, lakes, mineral springs, in which the islands are prolific, fifty of which have been analyzed and 117 others recorded, and the general water system of the archipelago; as also those on petrology and mineralogy, zoography, and the descriptions of trees and plants. As a useful application of scientific knowledge we notice that in the last-named treatise there is an alphabetical list of those woods which are suited for building purposes.

The second volume contains the special work of the staff of the Manila Observatory, under the direction of Father José Algué, the learned author of the standard work on the Cyclones of the Philippine Archipelago. It contains three complete treatises on Climatology, Seismology, and Terrestrial Magnetism. The first is the most important, being the result of thirty-five years' continuous observation of the meteorological phenomena of the islands, at the Manila Observatory and at secondary stations in connection with it. A mere inspection of the thirty-two plates of curves showing the variations of the meteorological elements, will bear witness to the immense

amount of patient toil that has been expended not only in securing the observations, but more important still, in collating and discussing them. The atmospheric pressure, the temperature of the air, the hygrometric conditions, and the rainfall are all exhaustively studied. With regard to the rainfall, comparative tables have been constructed, not only for the islands of the Philippine group, but also for Japan and the coasts of China and the United States. Excellent too is the discussion on the winds. In this connection the amount of cloud, the movements of the upper clouds, the different heights of the various strata have been determined with the greatest precision by means of photography, and their connection with temperature and pressure. The important practical bearing of such observations is seen when we learn that on a number of occasions during the last four years the observers by their aid have been enabled to suspect the approach of a destructive storm forty-eight hours before any indication was given by the barometer, and to announce at least twenty-four hours beforehand the direction and probable violence of the storm. This leads us to speak of the work on the "Cyclones" in the study of which both the late Father Faura and the present director of the observatory have shown great skill. Taking as his basis the curves of the regular barometric variations for every day and every month which had been reduced from a long series of observations, Father Faura was enabled to foretell with almost absolute accuracy the greater or less violence of a coming cyclone. His rule was that "the intensity of a typhoon depends on the amplitude of the deviation of the barometric indication from the exact and definitely known limit of the normal nocturnal and diurnal oscillation of barometric pressure." By this means he was enabled to advise Hong Kong and other distant stations with which he was in telegraphic communication of the approach of these destructive storms, and was the means of saving untold lives and valuable shipping from impending disaster. He even invented a special barometer on the face of which a needle pointed to various legends which indicated the sort of weather that was to be expected under cyclonic conditions. His successor has worthily followed in his footsteps, and by means of the adjunct of the observations of the upper clouds has been able to extend the knowledge of these destructive storms. He, too, has invented an ingenious typhoon-barometer which not only indicates the advent of

a storm, but shows its actual distance from the observer. It has been largely adopted by the captains of vessels sailing in the China seas. The last chapter in this excellent treatise is from the pen of Father Saderra, and contains a study of the violent storms of short duration but accompanied by electrical phenomena which visited Manila during the years 1888 to 1897.

Seismology, or the science of earthquakes, is treated exhaustively as far as concerns the Philippines in the second section of this volume. The centre or foci of earthquakes are determined with accuracy and exhibited in charts. There are also most interesting facsimiles of the records of the seismographs during some earthquake shocks, and photographs of the havoc and devastation inflicted upon buildings. As a practical application of these studies, the special means to be used in building construction to escape the effect of the shocks are pointed out, as also the regions which are most fruitful of destruction.

The last treatise concerns Terrestrial Magnetism. The position of the Manila Observatory lends importance to the results presented in the work, since it is situated only some eight and a half degrees to the north of the magnetic equator. The introduction of this study as a branch of the routine work at the observatory, dates from 1890, but already a work on the subject has been issued, written by Father Richard Cirera. In the present treatise the cyclical variations of the terrestrial magnetic elements are fully discussed and analyzed, and interesting and useful comparative tables exhibit the cognate observations obtained at some of the other magnetic observatories in the world, of which there are but very few.

It only remains to speak of the atlas, consisting of thirty maps most beautifully executed. In the Introduction, Professor Henry S. Pritchett, the Superintendent of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, tells us that "the entire absence of accurate surveys of many of the islands was necessarily a serious drawback, but the Jesuits spared no pains in securing all available data, and verified them by consultation with members of the other Religious Orders, as well as with the old residents, travellers, and explorers. To the admirable work of their own Order is due practically all of our present knowledge of the interior of Mindanao." As specimens of the kind of maps presented in the atlas, we may mention the general maps of

the islands, the maps giving the depths of the surrounding seas, that which indicates the meteorological and seismic stations scattered over the archipelago, that containing the distribution of earthquakes, the separate maps devoted to each larger member of the group of islands, and the fine maps of Manila Bay and the Strait of St. Juanico. The appearance of these handsome volumes and atlas at a time when so much obloquy is being directed against the Spanish Jesuits is most opportune, and they serve as a dignified answer to the falsehoods of their traducers.

2.—FAITH AND FOLLY.¹

The object of various essays collected in this volume is to enforce the principle laid down in the Book of Wisdom and by St. Paul, that all men are vain and foolish whom the contemplation of nature does not lead on to the recognition of her Author. As Mgr. Vaughan rightly insists, no discovery of modern science impairs or possibly can impair the cogency of the argument which, on grounds of pure reason alone, compels us to acknowledge that the world which we see proclaims itself as the work of a Creator whose perfections must immeasurably transcend all that we discover in that which He has made.

To recall the minds of men to this fundamental and elementary truth, to make them see that in its acceptance alone is true wisdom to be found, and that all philosophies which seek another basis do but delude the mind with a system which can never satisfy, is a task as imperatively suggested by the intellectual needs of our day as by its very nature it must be difficult so to perform as to justify its undertaking. By force of constant repetition, evolutionary shibboleths and maxims have come to be widely accepted as self-evident axioms which it is irrational to question, while the extraordinary accuracy with which facts are observed and verified, is generally supposed to lend irrefragable certitude to the theories founded not upon those facts themselves, but upon erroneous inferences from them. In such circumstances, the only hope of convincing those whom such theories have captivated is first to win their confidence, by showing that,

¹ *Faith and Folly.* By the Right Rev. Mgr. John Vaughan. ix. 485 pp. London: Burns and Oates. 5s. net.

while perfectly understanding their doctrine, we see farther than do they themselves, and find in it deficiencies which they must recognize when pointed out. It is emphatically a case for philosophy without assumptions. The Christian apologist must meet the unbeliever on his own ground in order to do him any good ; whereas if we start by assuming that faith is all which we ourselves know it to be, though it will be extremely easy to demonstrate that all who reject it are guilty of folly, the demonstration will not touch them at all, and they will remain more convinced than ever that wisdom is on their side, and folly on ours.

Here, as seems to us, is the weak point of the book before us, which will not, we apprehend, tend to attract the class of readers for whom it is designed. For our author, the truths of faith are the one great reality in the way of intellectual certitude, and in consequence he can scarcely realize the state of mind which honestly believes that in denying them man is following the teaching of reason and common sense. As Sir Isaac Newton considered the propositions of Euclid quite self-evident, so as to require no proof, so to Mgr. Vaughan it appears inconceivable that any one should fail to recognize the hand of God in everything around. Of course, all men ought to do so, and would do so too if, discarding all prepossession and prejudice, they were to study the question on its merits according to the methods of sound reasoning ; but until they have got so far as to be conscious of not having done their proper part, and while they are firmly persuaded that argument is their monopoly, will any good result from assurances that their position is altogether irrational ? Are they likely to be convinced, or even led to inquire, by such modes of argumentation as the following ?

Many a wiseacre is to be met with in these days who will declare with no little petulance his utter want of belief in the most essential doctrines of faith. "This," he will say, "cannot be ; that is impossible ; and as for the other, well, it does not commend itself to my mind, and I can't accept it." Commend itself to thy mind, indeed ! O, poor little worm ! wriggling in thy clayey bed ! Thou strange admixture of pride and folly ; thou pitiable and ignoble combination of arrogance, conceit, and stupidity ; who troubles himself about thy mind ? . . . What is the mind of a Plato, or an Aristotle, or a Solomon, compared to the mind of Him who with a breath formed all mind as well as all matter from nothing ? It is as darkness to light, as night to day, as

nothing to infinitude. . . . The attitude thou assumest escapes being ridiculous only by becoming so abominably blasphemous.¹

The simple unvarnished truth is that all the Huxleys, Tyndalls, Harrisons, Drapers, Cliffords, &c., &c., that ever were, are, or ever will be, could not construct for us the tiniest insect that crawls, nor the simplest flower that blooms; no, nor one small claw or gauzy wing; nor a leaf or rootlet of the humblest moss or liverwort. What, construct! Why, they cannot even explain any one of these things after it has been constructed. If interrogated they will ring out their sad changes in the old familiar style:

Ding Dong; Ding Dong.
Affinity, Radiation, Absorption,
Absorption, Radiation, Affinity;
Capillary attraction and Endosmosis,
Endosmosis and Capillary attraction.
Ding Dong; Ding Dong; Ding Dong.²

Yet these, alas! are the men who speak scornfully and with curled lip about our credulity and superstition. That life appeared where previously there was no life, and that animals existed where previously there were none, are hard and fast facts which do not admit of any serious controversy. Yet sooner than admit that beasts were created by the omnipotent hand of God, they will try and persuade us that they were developed from plants or vegetables; which, in their turn, were evolved from mud or protoplasm, and I know not what besides. Who can bring his reason to accept such an astounding statement? As well persuade us that the prehistoric trees produced legs of roast mutton and hot-buttered French rolls.³

Assuredly it is not in this manner that scientific unbelief will ever be refuted. It requires to be dealt with gravely and seriously, for although, beyond the point where the physical sciences have no more to tell us, dependence upon them alone must necessarily land the investigator in intellectual quagmires, yet within their proper domain they have in our days yielded results which are amongst the most wonderful triumphs of the human mind in any age. Their very brilliancy it is which is so apt to dazzle men's eyes and induce them to fancy that here at last we have an instrument for discovering all truth such as the world never knew before. Such an assumption is of course logically absurd; as to ultimate problems, we are with all our discoveries exactly where we have been since men began to think; but to do any good with those who are thus circumstanced, we must be careful not to place ourselves in a false position by showing ourselves less well acquainted with subjects

¹ P. 38.² P. 36.³ P. 181.

we undertake to discuss. Though it is by no means necessary to be well versed in the teachings of modern science in order to arrive at sound conclusions respecting the most vital questions which can occupy the human mind, yet without such equipment it is useless to address ourselves to those accustomed to regard scientific accuracy as the one thing needful for the acquisition of truth. And in this respect we very much fear that Mgr. Vaughan will be found to have not a few rifts in his armour, for he constantly commits himself to utterances concerning which hostile critics could find much to say. As we have seen, he seems to assume that evolutionists derive animals from "plants or vegetables," and to suppose that mud and protoplasm are very much the same thing; to neither of which propositions are many others likely to assent. He appears to believe that the lily of Palestine is a common weed in our meadows, and is inclined to accept the fable of the mummy-wheat which retains its germinating power "till thousands of years have rolled their weary lengths along." Even more startling is his very emphatic pronouncement upon another point. Size, he argues, being something merely relative, if the dimensions of the world and all that it contains, ourselves included, were to be proportionally increased or diminished some fine night, we should on awaking next morning be conscious of no alteration at all, inasmuch as everything would, in regard of size, bear precisely the same relation as before to everything else. But in thus summarily dealing with a very intricate problem, the writer leaves out of consideration what is essential to its solution. Size is not everything, least of all linear dimension. What about mass? Are we to suppose that the quantity of matter, *i.e.*, the number of its atoms, remains the same in each body after the change as before, or that it too is proportionally diminished or increased? In either case changes would result which could not be ignored for an instant. If, for example, our earth's diameter were increased ten-fold, its density remaining unchanged, its mass would be increased a thousand-fold, for this varies as the *cube* of the radius. Similarly, a six-foot man, developed proportionally to sixty feet, would contain a thousand times as much matter as before, and by Newton's law (making allowance for the increased distance from the centre of the sphere) would weigh ten thousand times as much as before. But bone and muscle, their section increasing only as the square, would be

utterly inadequate to sustain such a burden and would collapse like eggshells under an elephant. Therefore it is, that, as astronomers tell us, the greater planets, if inhabited by creatures with tissues at all resembling our own, must be the home of pigmies. A man of the organization which lives on the earth, would, if placed upon Jupiter, spread out under his own weight as flat as a pancake.

Of loose talk of this kind concerning scientific problems, the modern mind is rightly impatient; and it goes on to excuse itself from paying serious attention to anything which is said by one whom it can stigmatize as unscientific. It is because we believe that much harm is done by giving any colour to the notion that the champions of faith condemn what they do not properly understand, that we have undertaken the ungrateful task of criticizing a work inspired by such admirable motives, and one with the main scope of which we are absolutely in accord.

3.—ITALY TO-DAY.¹

Quite recently, in his *History of Italian Unity*, Mr. Bolton King told the story of the establishment of the present Italian Kingdom, and now follows another volume on *Italy To-day*, the joint work of Mr. Bolton King and Mr. T. Okey. The authors assure us in their Preface "that (they) have approached the various problems without prepossessions, and have done their best to understand and describe the point of view of each party." That they have tried their best in this way may be freely admitted, but unfortunately prepossessions may be strong even when unconscious; nor can it be said that they have succeeded in understanding, even imperfectly, the point of view of the Catholic party. Thus Leo XIII. is estimated as "a good man, but more statesman than saint, without any deep affection or spirituality," whose Encyclicals have "a common note of pessimism, which teaches that all authority is in peril, and that men can be saved only by coercion from error and license;" who "finds himself in a dilemma when he preaches obedience to authority, while himself attacking the Italian State;" who "admits, inconsistently, that the Republic is a

¹ *Italy To-day*. By Bolton King and Thomas Okey. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1901.

legitimate form of government, but believes firmly in coercion;" who began his Pontificate by striving to win over the European Governments, and in pursuing this purpose was not above engaging in unworthy intrigues, and callously sacrificing the interests of those who looked to him as their national defender; but who subsequently, on "finding that the masses looked with suspicion at his alliance with the Governments, made it his business to win the people" by placing himself at the head of a movement of Catholic Socialism; and who throughout all this "bold and clever policy" had but one ultimate end in view, "the recovery of the Temporal Power." All this, and much more of the same kind, which to Catholic readers seems so unintelligible in its variance from the palpable facts, is due not to any want of desire to be impartial, but to a sheer inability to comprehend the Catholic point of view. Still the defect is most unfortunate, as it vitiates even the very meagre allowance of pages which the authors have allotted to the religious aspects of modern Italian life, and renders their volume from this point of view almost worthless.

In other respects it is a most instructive volume, full of valuable matter and valuable reflections, the general trend of which, it will be admitted, hardly goes to show that the present Italian *régime* has made for the welfare of the Italian people.

Of the political parties which have hitherto guided the destinies of the State, the book has a poor opinion. Their condition is one of "chaos and decay;" they have "lost faith in their principles, faith in their country, faith in themselves;" their "policies seem little better than a selfish struggle for office, a blind resistance to forces that they cannot understand and cannot assimilate, and therefore fear." Of the leaders of the Left, Depretis, who was Premier between 1876 and 1887, was "an irresolute, sceptical man, with a profound knowledge of human vice and frailty, that took the place of principle or truth in his system of government;" who "created a party without a programme, that lived from hand to mouth on Parliamentary manœuvres, and nursed a shameless corruption, which ate out all that was wholesome in Italian politics." Crispi, who succeeded Depretis, "was as unscrupulous as Depretis in his methods, and had a hardy inconsistency that came not so much from any deliberate dishonesty, as from an impulsiveness which made him a slave to the passion of the moment, quite forgetful of the promises

and policy of yesterday;" whose "intolerance grew till the ex-Democrat became essentially a Despot;" who "had been brought up among conspiracies, and always thought that his opponents were conspiring." Giolitti, the present leader of the Constitutional Left, is described as, along with Depretis and Crispi, "the most smirched" of Italian Premiers. His "relations to the Bank scandals ought to have driven him from public life;" and "though he is personally disinterested, he has been an adept in political corruption, and even among Italian statesmen he bears no high name for scrupulousness." On the leaders of the Right the authors pass a more lenient judgment. Di Rudini is "personally honest, one of the very few leading men who came unscathed out of the Bank scandals;" Sonnino is "one of the few leading statesmen among the Constitutional parties with clean hands." But the party is one of pure reaction; its "older men, with their high ideals and more liberal principles, have died or drifted away in disgust," and it is now "composed of men whose interests or fears have made them hate and dread the whole democratic and social movement." The Republican party, according to the authors, has now spent its force. It is the Socialist party which they hold to be the party of the future, and it apparently has their sympathies. It polled at the recent elections some 160,000 votes, or one in eight of the whole number of votes recorded. "Alone" they say, "among Italian parties it stands boldly for purity of public life, and while well-meaning men of Right and Left have touched corruption with a trembling hand, the Socialists have smitten and spared not." "To the best and most thoughtful of the educated classes it appeals through its high idealism, its call to intellect, its protest against the baseness of public life, its splendid campaign against evil in high places." These are brave words, but it is easy to stand out boldly for purity of public life as against the corruption of others; it remains to be seen whether this new party will show greater probity itself when it gets its chance, and there are some things which the authors record of it, which cannot be said to found very solid hopes.

Of the prevalent electoral methods the authors have almost incredible facts to record. Restricted though the franchise is, not more than sixty per cent. of the registered electors go to the poll, and of these "a more than normal proportion vote from irrelevant motives." Not only do peasants vote at their

landlord's or employer's order, the mortgaged small proprietors of the South vote at the bidding of the bank that has their title-deeds, and at Naples a hundred or two "influential electors" use the *camorra* to carry their nominees, but "governmental pressure and private bribery reach to monstrous proportions." The Prefects are used to "prepare" the elections, and, if they refuse, are removed or suspended. And the nature of the power they can exercise may be gathered from the boast of one Prefect that "he could control all the elections of his province, as he could send all his Syndics to prison if necessary;" whilst "in Crispi's day they would arrest electors on false charges on the eve of elections and keep them in custody till the poll was over," and "in Sicily they have employed the Massia gangs to terrorize the electors." "Newspapers are subsidized from the secret funds;" "policemen are stationed at the polling-booths to shut out opposition voters." "Registers are tampered with in the revision courts." "A teacher of literature has been known to be struck off as illiterate, and at Catania, 5,000 electors out of 9,000, with University professors and lawyers among them, were removed at a single swoop." Last year, in the constituency of Corleone, "the police were sent round the villages to threaten the timid peasants that, if the Ministerialist candidates were defeated, they would be arrested in mass," and "a Massia gang of notorious criminals were given a batch of licenses to carry firearms, that they and their friends might terrorize the electors;" "manœuvres like these were reported from all parts of Italy at the recent elections." The authors will be followed by all their readers in their conclusion that "a Chamber elected by such methods is not likely to have a high character," but they must not be surprised if many readers draw still wider conclusions.

The upholders of United Italy are wont to justify their usurpation on the ground that the people clamoured for it, and that the people have an inalienable right of choosing their rulers. Hence the plebiscites taken after each successful invasion of a coveted territory. Of the Roman plebiscite of 1870, for instance, Mr. Bolton King, in his former work, states that it "showed 133,000 votes for annexation, and 1,500 against, on a register of 167,000." He tells us, indeed, on the authority of Cadorna, that on that occasion "the Government carefully avoided any pressure." But the Catholics contended that it was applied so extensively as to render the plebiscite a farce; and after

the insight into the electoral methods of the same party, which the authors now give us, they will be confirmed in their opinion. This, in fact, is, it seems to us, the general significance of *Italy To-day*. It is a terrible exposure of the character and methods of the men who have inflicted such woes on the Church of Italy.

4.—MOOTED QUESTIONS OF HISTORY.¹

We gladly welcome a new edition of this very practical little book, which is eminently adapted to the needs of our days, when all men are expected to know everything without having time to study anything. Our author, selecting the historical questions regarding which misconceptions and misrepresentations are most frequently encountered by Catholics, gives in each case a brief but adequate summary of the truth of the matter as disclosed by genuine research, and then quotes evidence, usually non-Catholic, in corroboration. Half a dozen samples will give some idea of the topics treated, twenty-seven in all: The Papal Power; Bibles before Luther; Indulgences; Character of the Reformers; Bloody Mary and Good Queen Bess; The Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

The important question, however, is not what subjects are treated, but how; and it is in respect of his method and temper that Mr. Desmond is chiefly to be commended. We have found no symptom of the malady to be feared in such undertakings, *trop de zèle*. There is no trying to prove too much, or to ignore what is unpleasant, and the authorities cited give evidence of reading sufficiently extensive to certify that both sides of each question are well understood.

5.—A BENEDICTINE MISCELLANY.²

It would be hard to name any more indefatigable investigator of a special province of ecclesiastical history than the accomplished editor of the *Revue Bénédictine*, Dom Ursmer Berlière. The articles on Benedictine History which he con-

¹ *Mooted Questions of History*. Revised Edition. By Humphrey J. Desmond. viii. and 328 pp. Boston: Marlier and Co., 1901. 75c.

² *Mélanges d'Histoire Bénédictine*. Par Dom Ursmer Berlière, O.S.B. Maredous, 1901.

tributes to that periodical are nearly all monuments of research, and fully deserve republication. The volume before us forms the third series of the collected papers which he has brought together under the title of *Mélanges*. In interest it is in no way inferior to its two predecessors. The importance of Bursfeld as one of the later centres of reform among the black monks can hardly be overestimated, and Dom Berlière gives us for the first time a connected and lucid account *bien documenté* of its origin and early development. The unpublished letters of Mabillon are also of interest, even if of less serious importance. They form an agreeable element of variety in passing to the author's more serious study of Chezal-Benoît.

This last article is excellent and contains among other good things some verses by Jean Fernand, who, drawing his inspiration from *Guido Juvenalis*, a famous Benedictine scholar of the reform, comments with considerable severity on the manners of those monks who resisted (c. 1500) this much needed renovation. It begins :

In monachos impudentes
Ite nunc pellis monachi vetuste
Sola quos vestris vacuumque nomen
Separat scurris et olente pinguem
Plebe popinam.

These two articles on Bursfeld and Chezal-Benoît are worth reading, in connection with Abbot Gasquet's studies of Pre-Reformation Monachism. We must own that they seem to us to render the *debacle* of the Religious Orders when assailed by Luther and Henry VIII. more readily intelligible than the English Benedictine's *couleur de rose* presentment of the same period. The Index at the end of the volume is a useful feature, but it might have been much fuller than it is.

Literary Record.

I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

FROM the Catholic Truth Society we receive various publications which testify alike to its constant activity and the extent of the field in which it labours to provide for the wants of Catholics. First in importance we must place the weighty admonition to parents by the Bishop of Newport, which originally appearing as a pastoral letter to the faithful under his charge (Advent, 1900), is now issued as a tract under the title *Our duty to our Children* (1d.). Parts X. and XI. of the Bishop of Clifton's *Early History of the Church of God*, cover the period from St. Justin to St. Polycarp (1d. each). At the same price are published, *St. Bede*, by Abbot Gasquet, in commendation of which it is needless to do more than name the author; *How to look for the Church*, by Mgr. John Vaughan; *Convocation never a canonical Synod*, by W. D. Gainsford; *The conversion of Cardinal Manning*, by Aimée Sewell; and though last not least in importance, the Judge's summing-up in the recent case of "*Ruthven v. de Bom*," which will we trust help to call the attention of Catholics to the great service rendered by the Catholic Truth Society in exposing the discreditable character of certain assailants of the Church, and also induce them to manifest their gratitude in a practical manner by contributing to defray the costs incurred in this particular instance. Besides these, we have at a penny the form for the reconciliation of a convert, edited by the Bishop of Newport; at twopence *The Temperament of Doubt*, by M. D. Petre; and at threepence *St. Francis and You*, by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., addressed primarily to Franciscan Tertiaries, and showing the eminently practical character of the work to which they are called.

St. Alphonsus' Devout Reflections for the profit of souls who desire to advance in Divine Love is newly translated from the

original by Father Edmund Vaughan, C.S.S.R. There is no necessity to say more in its commendation.

Good bright stories are always in demand, and those who have the care of children are often glad to know where they can find a book which, while preserving a healthy Catholic tone, will arouse and sustain the interest of young people. For this purpose we can conscientiously recommend *The Falcon of Langéac*, by Mrs. Henry Whiteley (St. Louis: Herder), now in its third edition. The coincidences, we may own, are sometimes rather startling; and the villains, of whom there are several, all of the thorough-paced type familiar in the fiction of our grandparents, are killed off to a man with ruthless dramatic justice. But the story has life in it, and that is everything. It will be read with pleasure by many who are not children.

II.—MAGAZINES.

Some contents of foreign Periodicals:

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE. (1901. 3.)

The Evidential Value of Private Revelations. *E. Michael.*
 Cornelius de Sneckis and Augustine de Getelen. *Dr. N. Paulus.*
 Harnack's Gospel. *L. Fonck.* The Authority of the Church over the Law of Sunday Rest. *F. Schmid.*
 Protestants and the Inspiration of Scripture. *Chr. Pesch.*
 Reviews, &c.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (May.)

Progress in Spark Telegraphy. *P. Dressel.* Early English Gothic Architecture. *J. Braun.* The New Star of the First Magnitude. *A. Müller.* Pekin and its Inhabitants. *J. Dahlmann.* Reviews, &c.

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (June 1 and 15.)

Catholic France at Lourdes. Giuseppe Mazzini. The Ancient Vases at the Louvre. Archæology—St. Saba on the Aventine. Fiction and Modern Spain. Patagonia. Reviews, &c.

LES ÉTUDES RELIGIEUSES. (June 5 and 20.)

The Evangelization of India. *A. Brou.* The Vocation of the Abbé de Broglie. *H. Bremond.* Bonald judged by his

Correspondence. *H. Chérot*. A new Interpreter of St. Augustine. *J. Bainvel*. The Waldeck Law and the Doom of the Congregations. *H. Prélôt*. Some Children's Portraits. *H. Bremond*. The Sacraments and Catholic Apologetic — a Question of Method. *S. Harent*. Reviews, &c.

LA REVUE GÉNÉRALE. (June.)

Molière's Women. *H. Davignon*. The Life of Pasteur. *H. Primbault*. Employers' Liability. *Ch. Dejace*. Progress of Catholicity in the British Empire during the Victorian Era. *Austin Oates*. Reviews, &c.

L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE. (June.)

A Bishop of the Fifth Century—Theodoret. *P. Forest*. Two Speeches in Parliament. *Abbé Delfour*. The Carthusian Order as seen in their Ephemerides. *P. Ragey*. The Question of Protestantism. *Sylvestre*. Gospel and other Texts. *E. Jacquier*. Reviews, &c.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. (June.)

The Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost. *J. M'Sorley*. The Limitations of Spiritual Direction. *Confessarius*. The Personal Factor in Religious Belief. *W. R. Carson*. Luke Delmege. By the author of "My New Curate." Systems and Counter-Systems of Education. *E. Magevney, S.J.*

DER KATHOLIK. (June.)

Corpus Christi at Mainz, c. 1400. *Bruder*. Rome in the Latter Half of the Jubilee Year. *Dr. A. Bellesheim*. St. Thomas' Teaching on Labour and Wages. *Karl Hilgenreiner*. Tetzl. *Dr. N. Paulus*.

